arXiv:1606.00152v1 [math.DS] 1 Jun 2016

EQUIDISTRIBUTION OF CURVES IN HOMOGENEOUS SPACES AND DIRICHLET'S APPROXIMATION THEOREM FOR MATRICES

NIMISH SHAH AND LEI YANG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study an analytic curve $\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ in the space of m by n real matrices, and show that if φ satisfies certain geometric condition, then for almost every point on the curve, the Diophantine approximation given by Dirichlet's Theorem can not be improved. To do this, we embed the curve into some homogeneous space G/Γ, and prove that under the action of some expanding diagonal subgroup $A = \{a(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, the translates of the curve tend to be equidistributed in G/Γ, as $t \to +\infty$.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Diophantine approximation for matrices.** In 1842, Dirichlet proved the following result on simultaneous approximation of a matrix of real numbers by integral vectors: *Given two positive integers m and n, a matrix $\Phi \in \mathrm{M}(m\times n, \mathbb{R})$, and any $N > 0$, there exist integral vectors $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^n \backslash \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{p}\| \le N^m \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Phi\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\| \le N^{-n}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the supremum norm; that is, $\|\mathbf{x}\| := \max_{1\le i\le k}|x_i|$ for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k) \in \mathbb{R}^k$.

Now we consider the following finer question: for a particular m by n matrix Φ, could we improve Dirichlet's Theorem? By improving Dirichlet's Theorem, we mean there exists a constant $0 < \mu < 1$, such that for all large $N > 0$, there exists nonzero integer vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\|\mathbf{p}\| \le \mu N^m$, and integer vector $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ such that $\|\Phi\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\| \le \mu N^{-n}$. If such constant μ exists, then we say Φ is DT_μ-improvable. And if Φ is DT_μ-improvable for some $0 < \mu < 1$, then we say Φ is DT-improvable (here DT stands for Dirichlet's Theorem).

This problem was firstly studied by Davenport and Schmidt in [DS70], in which they proved that almost every matrix $\Phi \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is not DT-improvable. In [DS70], they also proved the following result. For $m = 1$ and $n = 2$, $\mathrm{M}(1 \times 2, \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}^2$, one considers the curve $\phi(s) = (s, s^2)$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then for almost every $s \in \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$, $\phi(s)$ is not $DT_{1/4}$ improvable. This result was generalized by Baker in [Bak78]: for any smooth curve in $\mathbb{R}^2$ satisfying some curvature condition, almost every point on the curve is not DT_μ improvable for some $0 < \mu < 1$ depending on the curve. Bugeaud [Bug02] generalized the result of Davenport and Schmidt in the following sense: for $m = 1$, and general n, almost every point on the curve $\varphi(s) = (s, s^2, \dots, s^n)$ is not DT_μ-improvable for some small constant $0 < \mu < 1$. Their proofs are based on the technique of regular systems introduced in [DS70].

Recently, based on an observation of Dani [Dan84], as well as Kleinbock and Margulis [KM98], Kleinbock and Weiss [KW08] studied this Diophantine approximation problem in the language of homogeneous dynamics, and proved the following result: for $m = 1$ and arbitrary n, if an analytic

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E40; 11J83.

Key words and phrases. Dirichlet's theorem, Diophantine approximation, homogeneous spaces, equidistribution, Ratner's theorem.

N. Shah acknowledges support from an NSF grant.

L. Yang is supported in part by a Postdoctoral Fellowship at MSRI.

curve in $\mathrm{M}(1\times n,\mathbb{R})\cong\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies some non-degeneracy condition, then almost every point on the curve is not DT_μ-improvable for some small constant $0<\mu<1$ depending on the curve. Based on the same correspondence, Nimish Shah [Sha09b] proved the following stronger result: for $m=1$ and general n, if an analytic curve $\varphi: I=[a,b]\to\mathbb{R}^n$ is not contained in a proper affine subspace, then almost every point on the curve is not DT-improvable. For $m=n$, Lei Yang [Yan13a] provided a geometric condition and proved that if an analytic curve $\varphi: I=[a,b]\to\mathrm{M}(n\times n,\mathbb{R})$ satisfies the condition, then almost every point on φ is not DT-improvable. The geometric condition given there provides some hint on solving the problem for general (m,n), and will be discussed in detail later.

The purpose of this paper is to give a geometric condition for each (m,n), and show that if an analytic curve

$$\varphi: I=[a,b]\to\mathrm{M}(m\times n,\mathbb{R})$$

satisfies the condition, then almost every point on φ is not DT-improvable.

The geometric conditions called *generic* condition and *supergeneric* condition are defined as follows:

Definition 1.1.

For any m and n, let

$$\varphi: I=[a,b]\to\mathrm{M}(m\times n,\mathbb{R})$$

denote an analytic curve.

For $m=n$, we say φ is *generic* at $s_0\in I$ if there exists a subinterval $J_{s_0}\subset I$ such that for any $s\in J_{s_0}$, $\varphi(s)-\varphi(s_0)$ is invertible.

In order to define *supergeneric* condition, we need additional notation.

We consider the following two embeddings from $\mathrm{M}(m\times m,\mathbb{R})$ to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2m,\mathbb{R})$ of $\mathrm{SL}(2m,\mathbb{R})$:

$$\mathfrak{n}^+: X\in\mathrm{M}(m\times m,\mathbb{R})\mapsto\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{0}&X\\&\mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix}\in\mathfrak{sl}(2m,\mathbb{R}),$$

and

$$\mathfrak{n}^-: X\in\mathrm{M}(m\times m,\mathbb{R})\mapsto\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{0}&\\X&\mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix}\in\mathfrak{sl}(2m,\mathbb{R}).$$

Let

$$\mathcal{E}=\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{I}_m&\\&-\mathrm{I}_m\end{bmatrix}\in\mathfrak{sl}(2m,\mathbb{R}). \tag{1.2}$$

A Lie subgroup L of $H=\mathrm{SL}(2m,\mathbb{R})$ is called *observable* if there exists a finite dimensional linear representation V of H and a nonzero vector $v\in V$ such that the subgroup of H stabilizing v is equal to L. A Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}$ is called an *observable* Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2m,\mathbb{R})$, if it is the Lie algebra of some observable Lie subgroup $L\subset H$.

For the case of $m=n$, the curve φ is called *supergeneric* at $s_0\in I$ if it is *generic* at s_0 (with subinterval $J_{s_0}\subset I$), and for any proper observable subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}$ of $\mathfrak{sl}(2m,\mathbb{R})$ containing $\mathcal{E}$, we have

$$\{\mathfrak{n}^-((\varphi(s_1)-\varphi(s_0))^{-1}-(\varphi(s_2)-\varphi(s_0))^{-1}):s_1,s_2\in J_{s_0}\}\not\subset\mathfrak{l}. \tag{1.3}$$

For $m>n$, φ is called *generic* (*supergeneric*) if its transpose

$$\varphi^{\mathrm{T}}: I=[a,b]\to\mathrm{M}(n\times m,\mathbb{R})$$

is *generic* (*supergeneric*).

For $m<n$, we express $\varphi(s)=[\varphi_1(s);\varphi_2(s)]$, where $\varphi_1(s)$ is the first m by m block, and $\varphi_2(s)$ is the rest m by $n-m$ block. We say φ is *generic* (*supergeneric*) at $s_0\in I$, if there exists

a subinterval $J_{s_0} \in I$ such that for any $s \in J_{s_0}$, $\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0)$ is invertible; and if we define $\psi : J_{s_0} \to \mathrm{M}(m \times (n-m), \mathbb{R})$, by

$$\psi(s) = (\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0))^{-1}(\varphi_2(s) - \varphi_2(s_0))$$

then ψ is *generic* (*supergeneric*) at some $s_1 \in J_{s_0}$.

We say that φ is *generic* (*supergeneric*) or satisfies *generic* (*supergeneric*) condition, if φ is *generic* (*supergeneric*) at some $s_0 \in I$. Since φ is analytic, if it is *generic* (*supergeneric*) at one point of I then it will be *generic* (*supergeneric*) at all but finitely many points of I.

Remark 1.2.

(1) In [Yan13a], it is proved that for $m = n$, if there exists $s_0 \in I$ and a subinterval $J_{s_0} \subset I$ such that the derivative $\varphi^{(1)}(s_0)$ is invertible, $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$ is invertible for any $s \in J_{s_0}$, and $\{(\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0))^{-1} : s \in J_{s_0}\}$ is not contained in any proper affine subspace of $\mathrm{M}(m \times m, \mathbb{R})$, then almost every point on the curve is not DT-improvable. Here the *supergeneric* condition is weaker than the condition needed in [Yan13a].

(2) In the case of m and n being co-prime, the *generic* condition directly implies the *supergeneric* condition.

(3) For $m = 1$ and general n, the genericness condition is equivalent to the condition that the curve is not contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$.

In this paper we will prove the following result:

Theorem 1.3. *For any m and n, if an analytic curve*

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

is supergeneric*, then almost every point on φ is not DT-improvable. If $(m, n) = 1$, then the same result holds for* generic *analytic curves.*

1.2. **Equidistribution of expanding curves on homogeneous spaces.** Now we describe the correspondence between Diophantine approximation and homogeneous dynamics as follows.

Let $G = \mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{R})$, and let $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{Z})$. The homogeneous space G/Γ can be identified with the space of unimodular lattices of $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$. Every point $g\Gamma$ corresponds to the unimodular lattice $g\mathbb{Z}^{m+n}$. For $r > 0$, let B_r denote the ball in $\mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ centered at the origin and of radius r. For any $0 < \mu < 1$, the subset

$$K_\mu := \{\Lambda \in G/\Gamma : \Lambda \cap B_\mu = \{\mathbf{0}\}\}$$

contains an open neighborhood of $\mathbb{Z}^{m+n}$ in G/Γ. Let us define the diagonal subgroup $A = \{a(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ by

$$a(t) := \begin{bmatrix} e^{nt}\mathrm{I}_m & \\ & e^{-mt}\mathrm{I}_n \end{bmatrix}. \tag{1.4}$$

Now we consider the embedding

$$u : \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{R})$$

sending $\Phi \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ to

$$u(\Phi) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & \Phi \\ & \mathrm{I}_n \end{bmatrix}. \tag{1.5}$$

Suppose for some $0 < \mu < 1$, and any $N > 0$ large enough, there exist nonzero integer vector $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and integer vector $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ such that $\|\mathbf{p}\| \le \mu N^m$ and $\|\Phi\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\| \le \mu N^{-n}$. Then the lattice $a(\log N)u(\Phi)\mathbb{Z}^{m+n}$ has a vector $a(\log N)u(\Phi)(-\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ whose norm is less than μ, i.e., $a(\log N)u(\Phi)\mathbb{Z}^{m+n} \notin K_\mu$ for all $N > 0$ large enough. Thus, to show that $\Phi \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is not

DT_μ-improvable, it suffices to show that the trajectory $\{a(t)u(\Phi)[e] : t > 0\}$ meets K_μ infinitely many times. In particular, for an analytic curve

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R}),$$

if we could show that for almost every point $\varphi(s)$ on the curve the trajectory

$$\{a(t)u(\varphi(s))[e] : t > 0\} \text{ is dense,} \tag{1.6}$$

then we could conclude that almost every $\varphi(s)$ is not DT-improvable. In particular, if one can prove that the expanding curves $a(t)u(\varphi(I))[e]$ tend to be equidistributed in G/Γ as $t \to +\infty$, then (1.6) will follow (see [Sha09b] for detailed proof). It turns out that the equidistribution result described above holds for a much more general setting. In fact, one could prove the following result:

Theorem 1.4. *Let G be a Lie group containing $H = \mathrm{SL}(m + n, \mathbb{R})$, and $\Gamma < G$ be a lattice of G. Let μ_G denote the unique G-invariant probability measure on the homogeneous space G/Γ. Take $x = g\Gamma \in G/\Gamma$ such that its H-orbit Hx is dense in G/Γ. Let us fix the diagonal group*

$$A = \left\{ a(t) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{nt}\mathrm{I}_m & \\ & e^{-mt}\mathrm{I}_n \end{bmatrix} \right\}.$$

Let $\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ be an analytic curve. We embed the curve into H by

$$u : X \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R}) \mapsto u(X) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & X \\ & \mathrm{I}_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

For $t > 0$, let μ_t denote the normalized parameteric measure on the curve $a(t)u(\varphi(I))x \subset G/\Gamma$; that is, for a compactly supported continuous function $f \in C_c(G/\Gamma)$,

$$\int f \mathrm{d}\mu_t := \frac{1}{|I|} \int_{s \in I} f(a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) \mathrm{d}s.$$

If φ is generic*, then every weak-$*$ limit measure μ_∞ of $\{\mu_t : t > 0\}$ is still a probability measure. If the curve φ is* supergeneric*, then $\mu_t \to \mu_G$ as $t \to +\infty$ in weak-$*$ topology; that is, for any function $f \in C_c(G/\Gamma)$,*

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} \frac{1}{|I|} \int_{s \in I} f(a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) \mathrm{d}s = \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G.$$

Moreover, if $(m, n) = 1$, then generic *property will imply that $\mu_t \to \mu_G$ as $t \to +\infty$.*

Remark 1.5.

(1) To prove Theorem 1.3, we only need the above theorem with $G = H = \mathrm{SL}(n + m, \mathbb{R})$, $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(m + n, \mathbb{Z})$, and $x = [e] = \mathbb{Z}^{m+n} \in G/\Gamma$.
(2) Even in the case $G = H = \mathrm{SL}(m + n, \mathbb{R})$, Theorem 1.4 is still much stronger than Theorem 1.3, since it applies for arbitrary lattice $\Gamma < G$.

The study of limit distributions of evolution of curves translated by diagonalizable subgroups in homogeneous spaces has its own interest and has a lot of interesting connections to geometry and Diophantine approximation. One could summarize this type of problems as follows:

Problem 1.6. Let H be a semisimple Lie group, generated by its unipotent subgroups. Fix a diagonalizable one parameter subgroup $A = \{a(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset H$, and let $U^+(A)$ denote the expanding horospherical subgroup of A in H. Let G be a Lie group containing H, and let Γ be a lattice of G.

Let

$$\phi : I = [a, b] \to H$$

be a piece of analytic curve in H with nonzero projection on $U^+(A)$ (this will make sure that the translates of $\phi(I)$ by $\{a(t) : t > 0\}$ expand). Given a point $x = g\Gamma \in G/\Gamma$, Ratner's Theorem tells

that the closure of Hx is a finite volume homogeneous subspace Fx, where F is a Lie subgroup of G containing H. Let μ_F denote the unique probability F-invariant measure supported on Fx. One can ask whether the expanding curves $\{a(t)\phi(I)x : t > 0\}$ tend to be equidistributed in Fx, i.e., as $t \to +\infty$, the normalized parametric measure supported on $a(t)\phi(I)x$ approaches μ_F in weak-$*$ topology.

Remark 1.7. Without loss of generality, in this paper, we always assume that Hx is dense in G/Γ. If Hx is not dense, suppose its closure is Fx, then we may replace G by F, Γ by $F \cap x\Gamma x^{-1}$ (which is a lattice of F by the closeness of Fx).

Nimish Shah [Sha09c] and [Sha09a] studied the case $H = \mathrm{SO}(n, 1)$ and $G = \mathrm{SO}(m, 1)$ where $m \geq n$. In this case the diagonalizable subgroup $A = \{a(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a fixed maximal $\mathbb{R}$-split Cartan subgroup of H. In [Sha09c] it is proved that given an analytic curve

$$\phi : I = [a, b] \to H,$$

and a point $x = g\Gamma \in G/\Gamma$, unless the natural visual map

$$\mathrm{Vis} : \mathrm{SO}(n, 1)/\mathrm{SO}(n - 1) \cong \mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n) \to \partial\mathbb{H}^n \cong \mathbb{S}^{n-1}$$

sends the curve $\phi(I)$ to a proper subsphere of $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$, the translates $a(t)\phi(I)x$ of $\phi(I)x$ will tend to be equidistributed as $t \to +\infty$. In [Sha09a], the same result is proved when ϕ is only C^n differentiable. In [Sha09c] and [Sha09a], the obstruction of equidistribution is discussed and possible limit measures are described when the equidistribution fails. This result was generalized by Yang [Yan13b] in the following sense: for $H = \mathrm{SO}(n, 1)$ and arbitrary Lie group G containing H, if the same condition on the curve holds, then the expanding curve $a(t)\phi(I)x$ tends to be equidistributed as $t \to +\infty$. Shah [Sha09b] studied the case $m = 1$ of the problem we consider in this paper, and proved that if the analytic curve $\varphi : I \to \mathrm{M}(1 \times n, \mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}^n$ is not contained in a proper affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$, then the equidistribution holds. It turns out that this condition is the same as *generic* condition for $m = 1$. Later Yang [Yan13a] studied the case $m = n$.

When the *generic* condition holds but *supergeneric* condition does not, we want to understand the obstruction of equidistribution and describe the limit measures of $\{\mu_t : t > 0\}$ to some extent. This requires more subtle argument. In [Sha09c] and [Sha09c], obstruction of equiditribution and description of limit measures are clearly given unconditionally for the case $H = \mathrm{SO}(n, 1)$ and $G = \mathrm{SO}(m, 1)$ in the set up of Problem 1.6. In our case, the problem becomes much more complicated. In this paper, we only discuss the case $n = km$, and we conjecture that similar result remains true for general (m, n) such that $(m, n) > 1$ (for the case $(m, n) = 1$, *generic* is the same as *supergeneric*, so there is nothing in between).

1.3. **Relation to extremity of submanifolds in homogeneous spaces.** Another direction to study Diophantine properties of a real matrix $\Phi \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is to determine whether Φ is very well approximable. We say $\Phi \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is very well approximable if there exists some constant $\delta > 0$ such that there exist infinitely many nonzero integer vectors $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and integer vectors $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ such that

$$\|\Phi\mathbf{p} - \mathbf{q}\| \leq \|\mathbf{p}\|^{-n/m-\delta}.$$

A submanifold $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is called extremal if with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{U}$, almost every point is not very well approximable. Based on the same correspondence due to Dani [Dan84] and due to Kleinbock and Margulis [KM98], this problem can also be studied through homogenous dynamics. Kleinbock and Margulis [KM98] proved that if a submanifold $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathrm{M}(1 \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is nondegenerate, then $\mathcal{U}$ is extremal. Kleinbock, Margulis and Wang [KMW10] later gave a necessary and sufficient condition of a submanifold of $\mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ being extremal. The condition is stated in terms of a particular representation of $H = \mathrm{SL}(m + n, \mathbb{R})$ and could not be translated to a geometric condition. Recently, Aka, Breuillard, Rosenzweig and de Saxcé [Aka+14]

gave a family of subvarieties of $\mathrm{M}(m\times n,\mathbb{R})$ called pencils, and announced a theorem stating that if a submanifold $\mathcal{U}\subset \mathrm{M}(m\times n,\mathbb{R})$ is not contained in a pencil, then $\mathcal{U}$ is extremal. It turns out that the *generic* condition implies the condition given in [Aka+14]. We will discuss it in detail in Appendix A.

1.4. **Organization of the paper.** The paper is organized as follows: In §2, assuming the *generic* condition on φ, we will relate a unipotent invariance to limit measures of $\{\mu_t : t>0\}$, and show that every limit measure is still a probability measure. This allows us to apply Ratner's theorem. In §3 We will apply Ratner's theorem and the linearization technique to study the limit measure via a particular linear representation of H. Finally we will get a linear algebraic condition on φ. In §4, we will recall and prove some basic lemmas on linear representations, which are essential in our proof. In §5, assuming the *supergeneric* condition, we will give the proof of Theorem 1.4, as we have discussed before, Theorem 1.3 will follow from Theorem 1.4. In §6, assuming the *generic* condition, we will study the obstruction of equidistribution and limit measures of $\{\mu_t : t>0\}$. We will only discuss the case $n=km$, and give a conjecture on general case. In the appendix, we will discuss the condition given in [Aka+14] and its relation to our *generic* condition.

Notation 1.8. In this paper, we will use the following notation.

For $\epsilon>0$ small, and quantities A and B, $A\overset{\epsilon}{\approx} B$ means that $|A-B|\le\epsilon$. Fix a right G-invariant metric $d(\cdot,\cdot)$ on G, then for $x_1,x_2\in G/\Gamma$, and $\epsilon>0$, $x_1\overset{\epsilon}{\approx} x_2$ means $x_2=gx_1$ such that $d(g,e)<\epsilon$.

For two related variable quantanties A and B, $A\ll B$ means there exists a constant $C>0$ such that $A\le CB$, and $A\gg B$ means $B\ll A$. $O(A)$ denotes some quantity $\ll A$ or some vector whose norm is $\ll A$.

Acknowledgement. The second author thanks The Ohio State University for hospitality during his visit when the project was initiated. Both authors thank MSRI where they collaborated on this work in Spring 2015. The second author thanks Dmitry Kleinbock for helpful discussions on the generic condition and for drawing his attention to the work of Aka, Breuillard, Rosenzweig and de Saxcé [Aka+14].

2. Non-divergence of the limit measures and unipotent invariance

2.1. **Preliminaries on Lie group structures.** We first recall some basic facts of the group $H=\mathrm{SL}(m+n,\mathbb{R})$. Without loss of generality, throughout this paper we always assume $m\le n$.

The centralizer of the diagonal subgroup A, $Z_H(A)$, has the following form:

$$Z_H(A)=\left\{\begin{bmatrix}B & \\ & C\end{bmatrix} : B\in \mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{R}), C\in \mathrm{GL}(n,\mathbb{R}),\ \text{and}\ \det B\det C=1\right\}.$$

The expanding horospherical subgroup of A, $U^+(A)$ has the following form:

$$U^+(A):=\left\{u(X):=\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{I}_m & X\\ & \mathrm{I}_n\end{bmatrix} : X\in \mathrm{M}(m\times n,\mathbb{R})\right\}.$$

Similarly, the contracting horospherical subgroup $U^-(A)$ has the following form:

$$U^-(A):=\left\{u^-(X):=\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{I}_m & \\ X & \mathrm{I}_n\end{bmatrix} : X\in \mathrm{M}(n\times m,\mathbb{R})\right\}. \tag{2.1}$$

For any $z\in Z_H(A)$ and $u(X)\in U^+(A)$, $zu(X)z^{-1}=u(zX)$ where $z\cdot X$ is defined as follows:

$$\text{if } z=\begin{bmatrix}B & \\ & C\end{bmatrix}\in Z_H(A) \text{ and } X\in \mathrm{M}(m\times n,\mathbb{R}) \text{ then } z\cdot X:=BXC^{-1}. \tag{2.2}$$

This defines an action of $Z_H(A)$ on $\mathrm{M}(m\times n,\mathbb{R})$.

Similarly we can define the action of $Z_H(A)$ on $\mathrm{M}(n\times m,\mathbb{R})$ induced by the conjugate action of $Z_H(A)$ on $U^-(A)$.

Let $P^-(A):=Z_H(A)U^-(A)$ denote the maximal parabolic subgroup of H associated with A.

Definition 2.1. For any $X\in \mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{R})$, we consider the following three elements in the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ of H:

$$\mathfrak{n}^+(X):=\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{0}&X&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix},\qquad \mathfrak{n}^-(X^{-1}):=\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\\ X^{-1}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix},\qquad \mathfrak{a}:=\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{I}_m&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&-\mathrm{I}_m&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Then $\{\mathfrak{n}^+(X),\mathfrak{n}^-(X^{-1}),\mathfrak{a}\}$ makes a $\mathfrak{sl}(2,\mathbb{R})$- *triple*; that is, they satisfy the following relations

$$[\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{n}^+(X)]=2\mathfrak{n}^+(X)\quad [\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{n}^-(X^{-1})]=-2\mathfrak{n}^-(X^{-1}),\quad [\mathfrak{n}^+(X),\mathfrak{n}^-(X^{-1})]=\mathfrak{a}.$$

Therefore, there is an embedding of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ into H that sends $\begin{bmatrix}1&1\\0&1\end{bmatrix}$ to $\exp(\mathfrak{n}^+(X))$, $\begin{bmatrix}1&0\\1&1\end{bmatrix}$ to $\exp(\mathfrak{n}^-(X^{-1}))$, and $\begin{bmatrix}e^t&0\\0&e^{-t}\end{bmatrix}$ to $\exp(t\mathfrak{a})$. We denote the image of this $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ embedding by $\mathrm{SL}(2,X)\subset H$. Let us denote

$$\sigma(X):=\begin{bmatrix}\mathbf{0}&X&\mathbf{0}\\ -X^{-1}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix}\in \mathrm{SL}(2,X).$$

It is easy to see that $\sigma(X)$ corresponds to $\begin{bmatrix}0&1\\-1&0\end{bmatrix}\in\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$.

2.2. **Unipotent invariance.** Recall that for $t>0$, μ_t denotes the normalized parametric measure on the curve $a(t)u(\varphi(I))x$, and μ_G denotes the unique G invariant probability measure on G/Γ. Our aim is to prove that $\mu_t\to\mu_G$ as $t\to+\infty$. We first modify the measures μ_t to another measure λ_t and show that if $\lambda_t\to\mu_G$, then $\mu_t\to\mu_G$ as well. Then we could study $\{\lambda_t:t>0\}$ instead. The motivation for this modification is that any accumulation point of $\{\lambda_t:t>0\}$ is invariant under a unipotent subgroup.

The measure λ_t is defined as follows:

Definition 2.2 (cf. [Sha10, (5.2)])**.** Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\varphi^{(1)}(s)\neq\mathbf{0}$ for all $s\in I$. Since φ is analytic, there exists some integer $1\le b\le m$, such that the derivative $\varphi^{(1)}(s)$ has rank b for all $s\in I$ but finitely many points. Let $\mathrm{E}_b(m)$ be the m by m matrix defined as follows:

$$\mathrm{E}_b(m):=\begin{cases}\begin{bmatrix}\mathrm{I}_b&\mathbf{0}\\ \mathbf{0}&\mathbf{0}\end{bmatrix} & \text{if } b<m,\\ \\ \mathrm{I}_m & \text{if } b=m.\end{cases}$$

Given a closed subinterval $J\subset I$ such that $\varphi^{(1)}(s)$ has rank b for all $s\in J$, we define an analytic curve $z:J\to Z_H(A)$ such that $z(s)\cdot\varphi^{(1)}(s)=[\mathrm{E}_b(m);\mathbf{0}]$ for all $s\in J$. For $t>0$, we define λ_t^J to be the normalized parametric measure on $\{z(s)a(t)u(\varphi(s))x:s\in J\}$; that is, for $f\in C_c(G/\Gamma)$,

$$\int f\mathrm{d}\lambda_t^J:=\frac{1}{|J|}\int_{s\in J}f(z(s)a(t)u(\varphi(s))x)\mathrm{d}s. \tag{2.3}$$

Remark 2.3. For any subinterval $J\subset I$, we could similarly define μ_t^J to be the normalized parameter measure on $a(t)u(\varphi(J))x$.

Proposition 2.4. *Suppose that for any closed subinterval $J\subset I$ such that λ_t^J is defined, we have $\lambda_t^J\to\mu_G$ as $t\to+\infty$. Then $\mu_t\to\mu_G$ as $t\to+\infty$.*

Proof. Let $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_l \in I$ be all the points where $\varphi^{(1)}(s)$ does not have rank b. For any fixed $f \in C_c(G/\Gamma)$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we want to show that for $t > 0$ large enough,

$$\int f \mathrm{d}\mu_t \overset{4\epsilon}{\approx} \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G.$$

For each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, l\}$, one could choose a small open subinterval $B_i \subset I$ containing s_i such that

$$\left| (\sum_{i=1}^{l} |B_i|) \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G \right| \leq \epsilon |I|, \tag{2.4}$$

and for any $t > 0$,

$$\left| \int_{\cup_{i=1}^{l} B_i} f(a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) \mathrm{d}s \right| \leq \epsilon |I|. \tag{2.5}$$

Since f is uniformly continuous, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$, such that if $x_1 \overset{\delta}{\approx} x_2$ then $f(x_1) \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} f(x_2)$. We cut $I \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{l} B_i$ into several small closed subintervals $J_1, J_2, \ldots, J_p$ such that for every J_r, $z^{-1}(s_1)z(s_2) \overset{\delta}{\approx} e$ for any $s_1, s_2 \in J_r$.

Now for a fixed J_r, we choose $s_0 \in J_r$ and define $f_0(x) = f(z^{-1}(s_0)x)$. Then for any $s \in J_r$, because $z^{-1}(s_0)z(s)a(t)u(\varphi(s))x \overset{\delta}{\approx} a(t)u(\varphi(s))x$, we have

$$f_0(z(s)a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) = f(z^{-1}(s_0)z(s)a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} f(a(t)u(\varphi(s))x).$$

Therefore

$$\int f_0 \mathrm{d}\lambda_t^{J_r} \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} \int f \mathrm{d}\mu_t^{J_r}.$$

Because $\int f_0 \mathrm{d}\lambda_t^{J_r} \to \int_{G/\Gamma} f_0(x) \mathrm{d}\mu_G(x)$ as $t \to +\infty$, and $\int_{G/\Gamma} f_0(x) \mathrm{d}\mu_G(x) = \int_{G/\Gamma} f(z^{-1}(s_0)x) \mathrm{d}\mu_G(x) = \int_{G/\Gamma} f(x) \mathrm{d}\mu_G$ (because μ_G is G-invariant), we have that there exists a constant $T_r > 0$, such that for $t > T_r$,

$$\int f_0 \mathrm{d}\lambda_t^{J_r} \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G.$$

Therefore, for $t > T_r$,

$$\int f \mathrm{d}\mu_t^{J_r} \overset{2\epsilon}{\approx} \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G,$$

i.e.,

$$\int_{J_r} f(a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) \mathrm{d}s \overset{2\epsilon|J_r|}{\approx} |J_r| \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G.$$

Then for $t > \max_{1 \leq r \leq p} T_r$, we could sum up the above approximations for $r = 1, 2, \ldots, p$ and get

$$\int_{I \setminus \cup_{i=1}^{l} B_i} f(a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) \mathrm{d}s \overset{2\epsilon|I|}{\approx} (|I| - \sum_{i=1}^{l} |B_i|) \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G.$$

Combined with (2.4) and (2.5), the above approximation implies that

$$\int_I f(a(t)u(\varphi(s))x) \mathrm{d}s \overset{4\epsilon|I|}{\approx} |I| \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\int f \mathrm{d}\mu_t \overset{4\epsilon}{\approx} \int_{G/\Gamma} f \mathrm{d}\mu_G.$$

Because $\epsilon > 0$ can be arbitrarily small, we complete the proof. □

By this proposition, if we could prove the equidistribution of $\{\lambda_t := \lambda_t^I : t > 0\}$ as $t \to +\infty$ assuming that $\varphi^{(1)}(s)$ has rank b for all $s \in I$, then the equidistribution of $\{\mu_t : t > 0\}$ as $t \to +\infty$ will follow. Therefore, later in this paper, we will assume that $\varphi^{(1)}(s)$ has rank b for all $s \in I$ and define λ_t to be the normalised parametric measure on the curve $\{z(s)a(t)u(\varphi(s))x : s \in I\}$.

We will show that any limit measure of $\{\lambda_t : t > 0\}$ is invariant under the unipotent subgroup

$$W := \{u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}]) : r \in \mathbb{R}\}. \tag{2.6}$$

Proposition 2.5 (See [Sha09c]). *Let $t_i \to +\infty$ be a sequence such that $\lambda_{t_i} \to \mu_\infty$ in weak-$*$ topology, then μ_∞ is invariant under W-action.*

Proof. Given any $f \in C_c(G/\Gamma)$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we want to show that

$$\int f(u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])x)\mathrm{d}\mu_\infty = \int f(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_\infty.$$

Since $z(s)$ and $\varphi(s)$ are analytic and defined on the closed interval $I = [a, b]$, there exists a constant $T_1 > 0$ such that for $t \geq T_1$, $z(s)$ and $\varphi(s)$ can be extended to analytic curves defined on $[a - |r|e^{-(m+n)t}, b + |r|e^{-(m+n)t}]$. Throughout the proof, we always assume that $t_i \geq T_1$. Then $z(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})$ and $\varphi(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})$ are both well defined for all $s \in I$.

From the definition of μ_∞, we have

$$\int f(u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])x)\mathrm{d}\mu_\infty = \lim_{t_i \to +\infty} \frac{1}{|I|} \int_{s \in I} f(u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))x)\mathrm{d}s.$$

We want to show that

$$u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s)) \approx z(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})a(t_i)u(\varphi(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})). \tag{2.7}$$

Since $z(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i}) \approx z(s)$ for t_i large enough, it suffices to show that

$$u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s)) \approx z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})).$$

In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} & z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})) \\ = \; & z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s) + re^{-(m+n)t_i}\varphi'(s) + O(e^{-2(m+n)t_i})) \\ = \; & z(s)u(O(e^{-(m+n)t_i}))u(r\varphi'(s))a(t_i)u(\varphi(s)). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $z(s)$, we have the above is equal to

$$u(O(e^{-(m+n)t_i}))u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s)).$$

When t_i is large enough, $u(O(e^{-(m+n)t_i}))$ can be ignored. Therefore, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists $T > 0$, such that for $t_i > T$,

$$u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s)) \overset{\delta}{\approx} z(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})a(t_i)u(\varphi(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})).$$

Now for any $\epsilon > 0$, we choose $\delta > 0$ such that whenever $x_1 \overset{\delta}{\approx} x_2$, we have $f(x_1) \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} f(x_2)$. Then from the above argument, we have for $t_i > T$,

$$f(u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))x) \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} f(z(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})a(t_i)u(\varphi(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i}))x).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \tfrac{1}{|I|} \textstyle\int_{s \in I} f(u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m); \mathbf{0}])z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))x)\mathrm{d}s \\ \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} \; & \tfrac{1}{|I|} \textstyle\int_{s \in I} f(z(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i})a(t_i)u(\varphi(s + re^{-(m+n)t_i}))x)\mathrm{d}s \\ = \; & \tfrac{1}{|I|} \textstyle\int_{a + re^{-(m+n)t_i}}^{b + re^{-(m+n)t_i}} f(z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))x)\mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that when $t_i > 0$ is large enough,

$$\frac{1}{|I|}\int_{a+re^{-(m+n)t_i}}^{b+re^{-(m+n)t_i}} f(z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))x)\mathrm{d}s \overset{\epsilon}{\approx} \frac{1}{|I|}\int_a^b f(z(s)a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))x)\mathrm{d}s.$$

Therefore, for t_i large enough,

$$\int f(u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m);\mathbf{0}])x)\mathrm{d}\lambda_{t_i} \overset{2\epsilon}{\approx} \int f(x)\mathrm{d}\lambda_{t_i}.$$

Letting $t_i \to +\infty$, we have

$$\int f(u(r[\mathrm{E}_b(m);\mathbf{0}])x)\mathrm{d}\mu_\infty \overset{2\epsilon}{\approx} \int f(x)\mathrm{d}\mu_\infty.$$

Since the above approximation is true for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, we have that μ_∞ is W-invariant. □

2.3. **Non-divergence of limit measures.** We also need to show that any limit measure μ_∞ of $\{\lambda_t : t > 0\}$ is still a probability measure of G/Γ, i.e., no mass escapes to infinity as $t \to +\infty$. To do this, it suffices to show the following proposition:

Proposition 2.6. *For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact subset $\mathcal{K}_\epsilon \subset G/\Gamma$ such that $\lambda_t(\mathcal{K}_\epsilon) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for all $t > 0$.*

Remark 2.7. In this proposition we only assume φ is *generic*.

This proposition will be proved via linearization technique combined with a lemma in linear dynamics as in [Sha09b].

Definition 2.8. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ denote the Lie algebra of G, and denote $d = \dim G$. We define

$$V = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{d} \bigwedge^i \mathfrak{g},$$

and let G act on V via $\bigoplus_{i=1}^d \bigwedge^i \mathrm{Ad}(G)$. This defines a linear representation of G:

$$G \to \mathrm{GL}(V).$$

Remark 2.9. In this paper, we will treat V as a representation of H.

The following theorem due to Kleinbock and Margulis is the basic tool to prove that there is no mass-escape when we pass to a limit measure:

Theorem 2.10 (see [Dan84] and [KM98])**.** *Fix a norm $\|\cdot\|$ on V. There exist finitely many vectors $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_r \in V$ such that for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$, the orbit Γv_i is discrete, and moreover, the following holds: for any $\epsilon > 0$ and $R > 0$, there exists a compact set $K \subset G/\Gamma$ such that for any $t > 0$ and any subinterval $J \subset I$, one of the following holds:*

S.1 *There exist $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that*

$$\sup_{s\in J} \|a(t)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma v_j\| < R,$$

S.2

$$|\{s \in J : a(t)u(\varphi(s))x \in K\}| \geq (1-\epsilon)|J|.$$

Remark 2.11. For the case $\varphi(s)$ is polynomial curve, the proof is due to Dani [Dan84], for the case of analytic curve, the proof is due to Kleinbock and Margulis [KM98]. The crucial part of the proofs is to find some constants $C > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$ such that in this particular representation, all the

coordinate functions of $a(t)u(\varphi(\cdot))$ are (C,α)-good. Here a function $f: I \to \mathbb{R}$ is called (C,α)-good if for any subinterval $J \subset I$ and any $\epsilon > 0$, the following holds:

$$|\{s \in J : |f(s)| < \epsilon\}| \leq C \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\sup_{s\in J} |f(s)|} \right)^{\alpha} |J|.$$

Notation 2.12. Let $\mathcal{V}$ be a finite dimensional linear representation of a Lie group F. Then for a one-parameter diagonal subgroup $D = \{d(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ of F, we could decompose $\mathcal{V}$ as the direct sum of eigenspaces of D; that is,

$$\mathcal{V} = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{V}^{\lambda}(D),$$

where $\mathcal{V}^{\lambda}(D) = \{v \in \mathcal{V} : d(t)v = e^{\lambda t}v\}$.

We define

$$\mathcal{V}^{+}(D) = \bigoplus_{\lambda>0} \mathcal{V}^{\lambda}(D), \quad \mathcal{V}^{-}(D) = \bigoplus_{\lambda<0} \mathcal{V}^{\lambda}(D), \quad \mathcal{V}^{\pm 0}(D) = \mathcal{V}^{\pm}(D) + \mathcal{V}^{0}(D).$$

For a vector $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we denote by $v^{+}(D)$ ($v^{\lambda}(D)$, $v^{-}(D)$, $v^{0}(D)$, $v^{+0}(D)$ and $v^{-0}(D)$ respectively) the projection of v to $\mathcal{V}^{+}(D)$ ($\mathcal{V}^{\lambda}(D)$, $\mathcal{V}^{-}(D)$, $\mathcal{V}^{0}(D)$, $\mathcal{V}^{+0}(D)$ and $\mathcal{V}^{-0}(D)$ respectively) with respect to the above direct sums.

The proof of Proposition 2.6 depends on the following property of finite dimensional representations of $\mathrm{SL}(m+n,\mathbb{R})$:

Lemma 2.13 (Basic Lemma)**.** *Let V be a finite dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SL}(m+n,\mathbb{R})$, and let $A = \{a(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\} \subset \mathrm{SL}(m+n,\mathbb{R})$ denote the diagonal subgroup as in* (1.4)*. If an analytic curve*

$$\varphi : I = [a,b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

is generic*, then for any nonzero vector $v \in V$, there exists some $s \in I$ such that*

$$u(\varphi(s))v \notin V^{-}(A).$$

A proof of this statement is one of the most important technical contributions of this paper, and we will postpone its proof to §4.

Proof of Proposition 2.6 assuming Lemma 2.13. Let V be as in Definition 2.8. Since $A \subset H$ is a diagonal subgroup, we have the following decomposition:

$$V = \bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}} V^{\lambda}(A)$$

where $V^{\lambda}(A)$ is defined as in Notation 2.12. Choose the norm $\|\cdot\|$ on V to be the maximum norm associated to some choices of norms on $V^{\lambda}(A)$'s.

For contradiction we assume that there exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that for any compact subset $\mathcal{K} \subset G/\Gamma$, there exist some $t > 0$ such that $\lambda_t(\mathcal{K}) < 1 - \epsilon$. Now we fix a sequence $\{R_i > 0 : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ tending to zero. By Theorem 2.10, for any R_i, there exists a compact subset $\mathcal{K}_i \subset G/\Gamma$, such that for any $t > 0$, one of the following holds:

S1. There exist $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and $j \in \{1,\dots,r\}$ such that

$$\sup_{s\in I} \|a(t)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma v_j\| < R_i,$$

S2.

$$|\{s \in I : a(t)u(\varphi(s))x \in \mathcal{K}_i\}| \geq (1-\epsilon)|I|.$$

From our hypothesis, for each $\mathcal{K}_i$, there exists some $t_i > 0$ such that *S2.* does not hold. So there exist $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$ and $v_{j(i)}$ such that

$$\sup_{s\in I} \|a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma_i v_{j(i)}\| < R_i. \tag{2.8}$$

By passing to a subsequence of $\{i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, we may assume that $v_{j(i)} = v_j$ remains the same for all i.

Since Γv_j is discrete in V, we have $t_i \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$ and there are the following two cases:

Case 1. By passing to a subsequence of $\{i \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\gamma_i v_j = \gamma v_j$ remains the same for all i.
Case 2. $\|\gamma_i v_j\| \to \infty$ along some subsequence.

For *Case 1.*: We have $a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma v_j \to \mathbf{0}$ as $i \to \infty$ for all $s \in I$. This implies that

$$\{u(\varphi(s))g\gamma v_j\}_{s\in I} \subset V^-(A),$$

which contradicts Lemma 2.13.

For *Case 2.*: After passing to a subsequence, we have

$$v := \lim_{i\to\infty} g\gamma_i v_j/\|g\gamma_i v_j\|, \quad \|v\| = 1, \text{ and } \lim_{i\to\infty} \|g\gamma_i v_j\| = \infty. \tag{2.9}$$

By Lemma 2.13, let $s \in I$ be such that $u(\varphi(s))v \notin V^-(A)$. Then by (2.9) there exists $\delta_0 > 0$ and $i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|(u(\varphi(s))g\gamma_i v_j)^{0+}\| \geq \delta_0 \|g\gamma_i v_j\|, \quad \forall i \geq i_0.$$

Then

$$\|a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma_i v_j\| \geq \delta_0 \|g\gamma_i v_j\| \to \infty, \text{ as } i \to \infty,$$

which contradicts (2.8). Thus Cases 1 and 2 both lead to contradictions. □

Remark 2.14. The same proof also shows that any limit measure of $\{\mu_t : t > 0\}$ is still a probability measure, which is the non-divergence part of Theorem 1.4.

3. Ratner's theorem and linearization technique

Take any convergent subsequence $\lambda_{t_i} \to \mu_\infty$. By Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.6, μ_∞ is a W-invariant probability measure on G/Γ, where W is a unipotent one-parameter subgroup given by (6.2). We will apply Ratner's theorem and the linearization technique to understand the measure μ_∞.

Notation 3.1. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be the collection of proper analytic subgroups $L < G$ such that $L \cap \Gamma$ is a lattice of L. Then $\mathcal{L}$ is a countable set ([Rat91]).

For $L \in \mathcal{L}$, define:

$$N(L, W) := \{g \in G : g^{-1}Wg \subset L\}, \text{ and } S(L, W) := \bigcup_{L'\in\mathcal{L}, L'\subsetneq L} N(L', W).$$

We formulate Ratner's measure classification theorem as follows (cf. [MS95]):

Theorem 3.2 ([Rat91])**.** *Given the W-invariant probability measure μ on G/Γ, if μ is not G-invariant then there exists $L \in \mathcal{L}$ such that*

$$\mu(\pi(N(L, W))) > 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mu(\pi(S(L, W))) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover, almost every W-ergodic component of μ on $\pi(N(L, W))$ is a measure of the form $g\mu_L$ where $g \in N(L, W)\backslash S(L, W)$, μ_L is a finite L-invariant measure on $\pi(L)$, and $g\mu_L(E) = \mu_L(g^{-1}E)$ for all Borel sets $E \subset G/\Gamma$. In particular, if $L \lhd G$, then the restriction of μ on $\pi(N(L, W))$ is L-invariant.

If $\mu_\infty = \mu_G$, then there is nothing to prove. So we may assume $\mu_\infty \neq \mu_G$. Then by Ratner's Theorem, there exists $L \in \mathcal{L}$ such that

$$\mu_\infty(\pi(N(L,W))) > 0 \text{ and } \mu_\infty(\pi(S(L,W))) = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Now we want to apply the linearization technique to obtain algebraic consequences of this statement.

Notation 3.3. Let V be the finite dimensional representation of G defined as in Definition 2.8, for $L \in \mathcal{L}$, we choose a basis $\mathfrak{e}_1, \mathfrak{e}_2, \dots, \mathfrak{e}_l$ of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{l}$ of L, and define

$$p_L = \wedge_{i=1}^{l} \mathfrak{e}_i \in V.$$

Define

$$\Gamma_L := \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \gamma p_L = \pm p_L\}.$$

From the action of G on p_L, we get a map:

$$\eta : G \to V,$$
$$g \mapsto g p_L.$$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the Zariski closure of $\eta(N(L,W))$ in V. Then $N(L,W) = G \cap \eta^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$.

Using the fact that φ is analytic, we obtain the following consequence of the linearization technique (cf. [Sha09c; Sha09b; Sha10]).

Proposition 3.4 ([Sha09b, Proposition 5.5])**.** *Let C be a compact subset of $N(H,W) \setminus S(H,W)$. Given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a compact set $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{A}$ such that, given a relatively compact neighborhood Φ of $\mathcal{D}$ in V, there exists a neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ of $C\Gamma$ in G/Γ such that for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and subinterval $J \subset I$, one of the following statements holds:*

SS1. $|\{s \in J : a(t)u(\varphi(s))g\Gamma \in \mathcal{O}\}| \leq \epsilon |J|$.

SS2. There exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $a(t)z(s)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma p_L \in \Phi$ for all $s \in J$.

The following proposition provides the obstruction to the limiting measure not being G-invariant in terms of linear actions of groups, and it is a key result for further investigations.

Proposition 3.5. *There exists a $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that*

$$\{u(\varphi(s))g\gamma p_L\}_{s \in I} \subset V^{-0}(A). \tag{3.3}$$

Proof (assuming Lemma 2.13). By (3.2), there exists a compact subset $C \subset N(L,W)) \setminus S(L,W)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\mu_\infty(C\Gamma) > \epsilon > 0$. Apply Proposition 3.4 to obtain $\mathcal{D}$, and choose any Φ, and obtain a $\mathcal{O}$ so that either *SS1.* or *SS2.* holds. Since $\lambda_{t_i} \not\to \mu_\infty$, we conclude that *SS1.* does not hold for $t = t_i$ for all $i \geq i_0$. Therefore for every $i \geq i_0$, *SS2.* holds and there exists $\gamma_i \in \Gamma$ such that

$$a(t_i)z(s)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma_i p_L \subset \Phi. \tag{3.4}$$

Since Γp_L is discrete in V, by passing to a subsequence, there are two cases:

Case 1. $\gamma_i p_L = \gamma p_L$ for some $\gamma \in \Gamma$ for all i; or
Case 2. $\|\gamma_i p_L\| \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$.

In *Case 1*, since Φ is bounded in (3.4), we deduce that $z(s)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma p_L \subset V^{-0}(A)$ for all $s \in I$. Since $V^{-0}(A)$ is $Z_H(A)$-invartiant, (3.3) holds.

In *Case 2*, by arguing as in the *Case 2.* of the Proof of Proposition 2.6, using genericness of φ and Lemma 2.13, we obtain that $\|a(t_i)u(\varphi(s))g\gamma_i p_L\| \to \infty$. This contradicts (3.4), because $z(s) \subset Z_H(A)$ and Φ is bounded. Thus *Case 2* does not occur. □

Our goal is to obtain an explicit geometric condition on $\varphi(I)$ which implies that the linear algebraic condition (3.3) does not hold.

4. Some linear dynamical results

We shall start with a dynamical lemma about finite dimensional representations of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ which sharpens the earlier results due to Shah [Sha09c, Lemma 2.3] and Yang [Yan13a].

Lemma 4.1. *Let V be a finite dimensional linear representation of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$. Let*

$$A=\left\{a(t):=\begin{bmatrix}e^t & \\ & e^{-t}\end{bmatrix}: t\in\mathbb{R}\right\},\ U=\left\{u(s):=\begin{bmatrix}1 & s\\ 0 & 1\end{bmatrix}: s\in\mathbb{R}\right\},\ U^-=\left\{u^-(s):=\begin{bmatrix}1 & 0\\ s & 1\end{bmatrix}: s\in\mathbb{R}\right\}.$$

Express V as the direct sum of eigenspaces with respect to the action of A:

$$V=\bigoplus_{\lambda\in\mathbb{R}} V^\lambda(A),\ \text{where } V^\lambda(A):=\{v\in V: a(t)v=e^{\lambda t}v:\forall t\in\mathbb{R}\}.$$

For any $v\in V\setminus\{0\}$ and $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$, let $v^\lambda=v^\lambda(A)$ denote the $V^\lambda(A)$-component of v, $\lambda^{\max}(v)=\max\{\lambda: v^\lambda\neq 0\}$, and $v^{\max}=v^{\lambda^{\max}}(v)$. Then for any $r\neq 0$,

$$\lambda^{\max}(u(r)v)\geq -\lambda^{\max}(v). \tag{4.1}$$

In particular,

$$\text{if } \lambda^{\max}(v)<0 \text{ then } \lambda^{\max}(u(r)v)>0,\ \forall r\neq 0. \tag{4.2}$$

Moreover, if the equality holds in (4.1) *then*

$$v=u^-(-r^{-1})v^{\max} \text{ and } (u(r)v)^{\max}=\sigma(r)v^{\max},\ \text{where } \sigma(r)=\begin{bmatrix}0 & r\\ -r^{-1} & 0\end{bmatrix}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. Observe that $u(1)u^-(-1)u(1)=\sigma(1)$, $u(-1)u^-(1)u(-1)=\sigma(-1)$ and for $r\neq 0$, conjugating all terms of these equalities by $a(\log(|r|/2))$ we get $u(r)u^-(-r^{-1})u(r)=\sigma(r)$, and hence

$$u(r)=\sigma(r)u(-r)u^-(r^{-1}),\ \forall r\neq 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Since $\sigma(r)a(t)\sigma(r)^{-1}=a(-t)$ for all $r\neq 0$, we have that

$$\sigma(r)V^\lambda(A)=V^{-\lambda}(A),\ \text{for all } \lambda.$$

Hence for any $v\in V\setminus\{0\}$,

$$\lambda^{\max}(\sigma(r)v)=-\lambda^{\min}(v),\ \text{and } (\sigma(r)v)^{\max}=\sigma(r)v^{\min}. \tag{4.5}$$

For any $r\in\mathbb{R}$, since $u(r)$ is unipotent and $a(t)u(r)a(-t)=u(e^{2t}r)$, we have that

$$\lambda^{\min}(u(r)v)=\lambda^{\min}(v). \tag{4.6}$$

Similarly, for any $s\in\mathbb{R}$, we have $a(t)u^-(s)a(-t)=u^-(e^{-2t}s)$, and hence

$$\lambda^{\max}(u^-(s)v)=\lambda^{\max}(v). \tag{4.7}$$

Using the above relations (4.4), (4.5), (4.6) and (4.7), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^{\max}(u(r)v)=\lambda^{\max}(\sigma(r)u(-r)u^-(r^{-1})v)&=-\lambda^{\min}(u(-r)u^-(r^{-1})v)\\ &=-\lambda^{\min}(u^-(r^{-1})v)\geq-\lambda^{\max}(u^-(r^{-1})v)=-\lambda^{\max}(v).\end{aligned}$$

Further if there are all equalities in the above relation, then

$$\lambda^{\min}(u^-(r^{-1})v)=\lambda^{\max}(u^-(r^{-1})v)=\lambda^{\max}(v).$$

Therefore,

$$u^-(r^{-1})v=(u^-(r^{-1})v)^{\max}=v^{\max};\ \text{that is, } v=u^-(-r^{-1})v^{\max},$$

and

$$(u(r)v)^{\max}=\sigma(r)(u(-r)u^-(r^{-1})v)^{\min}=\sigma(r)(u^-(r^{-1})v)^{\min}=\sigma(r)(u^-(r^{-1})v)^{\max}=\sigma(r)v^{\max}.$$

□

Lemma 4.1 immediately implies the following statement:

Corollary 4.2. *Let the notation be as in Lemma 4.1. If $v, u(r)v \in V^{0-}(A)$ for some $r \neq 0$, then $\lambda^{\max}(v) = 0$ and $v = u^-(r^{-1})v^0$, where $v^0 \neq \mathbf{0}$ denotes the $V^0(A)$ component of v.*

4.1. **Linear dynamical lemmas for $\mathrm{SL}(m+n,\mathbb{R})$ representations.** First we give the proof of the basic lemma (Lemma 2.13) that we used more than once in previous sections. The new techniques developed in this section forms the core of this paper, and we expect these techniques to be valuable for other problems.

Proof of Lemma 2.13. We use induction to complete the proof. For the case $m = n$, the lemma is due to Yang [Yan13a]. We provide a proof here for the sake of self-containedness.

When $m = n$, we take a point s_0 and a subinterval $J_{s_0} \subset I$ such that for all $s \in J_{s_0}$, $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0) \in \mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{R})$. Then we consider the subgroup $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)) \cong \mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathrm{SL}(2m,\mathbb{R})$ for some fixed $s \in J_{s_0}$ (see Definition 2.1), and apply Corollary 4.2 for $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$ replaced by $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0))$, v replaced by $u(\varphi(s_0))v$ and $u(r)$ replaced by $u(\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0))$. Then one of $u(\varphi(s_0))v$ and $u(\varphi(s))v$ is not contained in $V^-(A)$. This proves the statement for $m = n$.

If $m > n$ then by applying a suitable inner automorphism of $\mathrm{SL}(m+n,\mathbb{R})$ given by a coordinate permutation $\sigma_{m,n}$, we can covert this problem to the case of $m < n$. Therefore we will assume that $m < n$.

As inductive hypothesis, we assume that for all (m', n') such that $m' \leq m$, $n' \leq n$ and $m' + n' < m + n$, the result holds. We want to prove the result holds for (m, n).

For contradiction, we assume that for some nonzero vector $v \in V$, such that

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^-(A)$$

for all $s \in I$. For $s \in I$, let $\mu_0(s) = \max\{\lambda : (u(\varphi(s))v)^\lambda(A) \neq 0\}$ and $\mu_0 = \max\{\mu_0(s) : s \in I\}$. Since φ is analytic, we have $\mu_0(s) = \mu_0$ for all but finitely many $s \in I$. Also by our assumption we have that

$$\mu_0 < 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Fix $s_0 \in I$ and a subinterval $J_{s_0} \subset I$ such that $\mu_0(s) = \mu_0$ for all $s \in J_{s_0}$ and if we write $\varphi(s) = [\varphi_1(s); \varphi_2(s)]$, then $\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0) \in \mathrm{GL}(m,\mathbb{R})$ for $s \in J_{s_0}$. Let

$$\psi : J_{s_0} \to \mathrm{M}(m \times (n-m),\mathbb{R}), \text{ be defined by } \psi(s) := (\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0))^{-1}(\varphi_2(s) - \varphi_2(s_0)).$$

Then ψ is *generic* by the of genericness of φ (see Definition 1.1). Replacing v by $u(\varphi(s_0))v$ and $\varphi(s)$ by $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$, we may assume that $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$.

For any fixed $s \in J_{s_0}$, it is straightforward to verify that

$$u(\varphi(s)) = u'(-\psi(s))u([\varphi_1(s); \mathbf{0}])u'(\psi(s)), \text{ where} \tag{4.9}$$

$$u'(Y) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & & Y \\ & \mathrm{I}_m & \\ & & \mathrm{I}_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} \in Z_H(A) \text{ for } Y \in M(m \times (n-m),\mathbb{R}). \tag{4.10}$$

Therefore $u(\varphi(s))v \in V^-(A)$ implies that

$$u([\varphi_1(s); \mathbf{0}])u'(\psi(s))v \in V^-(A).$$

Let us denote

$$A_1 := \left\{ a_1(t) := \begin{bmatrix} e^t\mathrm{I}_m & & \\ & e^{-t}\mathrm{I}_m & \\ & & \mathrm{I}_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

and

$$A_2 := \left\{ a_2(t) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & & \\ & e^{(n-m)t}\mathrm{I}_m & \\ & & e^{-mt}\mathrm{I}_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

We express V as the direct sum of common eigenspaces of A_1 and A_2:

$$V = \bigoplus_{\delta_1,\delta_2} V^{\delta_1,\delta_2}, \text{ where } V^{\delta_1,\delta_2} := \left\{ v \in V : a_1(t)v = e^{\delta_1 t}v, a_2(t)v = e^{\delta_2 t}v \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}. \tag{4.11}$$

Then because $a(t) = a_1(nt)a_2(t)$, we have

$$V^{\lambda}(A) = \bigoplus_{n\delta_1+\delta_2=\lambda} V^{\delta_1,\delta_2}. \tag{4.12}$$

For any vector $v \in V$, let v^{δ_1,δ_2} denote the projection of v onto the eigenspace V^{δ_1,δ_2}.

We also decompose V as the direct sum of irreducible sub-representations of $A \ltimes \mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi_1(s))$. For any such sub-representation $W \subset V$, let $p_W : V \to W$ denote the A-equivariant projection. By the theory of finite dimensional representations of $\mathrm{SL}(2,\mathbb{R})$, there exists a basis $\{w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_r\}$ of W such that

$$a_1(t)w_i = e^{(r-2i)t}w_i, \quad \text{for } 0 \le i \le r. \tag{4.13}$$

We claim that each w_i is also an eigenvector for A. In fact,

$$a(t) = a_1((m+n)t/2)b(t), \quad \text{where } b(t) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\frac{n-m}{2}t}\mathrm{I}_{2m} & \\ & e^{-mt}\mathrm{I}_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} \in Z_H(\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi_1(s)),$$

and hence $b(t)$ acts on W as a scaler $e^{\delta t}$ for some $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore,

$$a(t)w_i = e^{((r-2i)(m+n)/2+\delta)t}w_i, \quad \text{for } 1 \le i \le r. \tag{4.14}$$

Since $(m+n)/2 > 0$, if $k < i$ then the A-weight of w_k is strictly greater than the A-weight of w_i.

Since $u'(\psi(s)) \in Z_H(A)$, μ_0 is the highest A-weight for v, we have that μ_0 is also the highest A-weight for $u'(\psi(s))v$ and

$$(u'(\psi(s))v)^{\mu_0}(A) = u'(\psi(s))v^{\mu_0}(A).$$

Now suppose that W as above is such that $p_W(u'(\psi(s))v^{\mu_0}(A)) \neq \mathbf{0}$. Then

$$p_W(u'(\psi(s))v^{\mu_0}(A)) = a_i w_i, \text{ for some } 0 \le i \le r,\ 0 \neq a_i \in \mathbb{R};$$

by (4.14) $\mu_0 = (r-2i)(m+n)/2 + \delta$. For $k < i$, the weight of w_k for A_1 is greater than that of w_i, so the A-weight of w_k is greater than the A-weight of w_i which equals μ_0. Since the projection p_W is A-equivariant and μ_0 is the highest A-weight, we have

$$p_W(u'(\psi(s))v) = \sum_{k \ge i} a_k w_k, \quad \text{where } a_k \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We claim that $r - 2i \ge 0$. In fact, if $r - 2i < 0$, then by (4.13), $p_W(u'(\psi(s))v) \in V^-(A_1)$. By Corollary 4.2,

$$V^{-0}(A_1) \not\ni u([\varphi_1(s); \mathbf{0}])p_W(u'(\psi(s))v) = p_W(u([\varphi_1(s); \mathbf{0}])u'(\psi(s))v).$$

So $p_W(u([\varphi_1(s); \mathbf{0}])u'(\psi(s))v)$ must have nonzero projection on $\mathbb{R}w_k$ for some $k < i$. Hence $u([\varphi_1(s); \mathbf{0}])u'(\psi(s))v$ has nonzero projection $V^{\mu}(A)$ for some $\mu > \mu_0$. Now since $u'(-\psi(s)) \in Z_H(A)$, the projection of $u(\varphi(s))v = u'(-\psi(s))u([\varphi_1(s); \mathbf{0}])u'(\psi(s))v$ on $V^{\mu}(A)$ is nonzero for $\mu > \mu_0$. This contradicts our choice of μ_0 and proves the claim that $r - 2i \ge 0$.

This claim implies that for any (δ_1, δ_2), if $(u'(\psi(s))v^{\mu_0}(A))^{\delta_1,\delta_2} \neq \mathbf{0}$ then $\delta_1 \geq 0$. Since $\mu_0 = n\delta_1 + \delta_2 < 0$, and we have $\delta_2 < 0$. In other words,

$$u'(\psi(s))v^{\mu_0}(A) \in V^-(A_2),\ \forall s \in J_{s_0}.$$

Now $u'(\psi(s))$ and A_2 are both contained in

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & \\ & \mathrm{SL}(n,\mathbb{R}) \end{bmatrix} \cong \mathrm{SL}(m + (n-m), \mathbb{R}).$$

Our inductive hypothesis for $(m, n-m)$ tells that this is impossible because ψ is *generic*.
This finishes the proof. □

For *supergeneric* curves, we want to obtain the following stronger conclusion.

Lemma 4.3. *Let V be an irreducible representation of $H = \mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{R})$. Let*

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

be a supergeneric *analytic curve. Then if there is a nonzero vector $v \in V$ such that*

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^{-0}(A),$$

for all $s \in I$, then V is a trivial representation.

To prove this lemma, we will need the following observation.

Lemma 4.4. *Let V be a finite dimensional representation of $\mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{R})$ and let*

$$A := \left\{ a(t) := \begin{bmatrix} e^{nt}\mathrm{I}_m & \\ & e^{-mt}\mathrm{I}_n \end{bmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Let

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

be an analytic curve. Suppose there exists a nonzero vector $v \in V$ such that

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^{-0}(A),$$

for all $s \in I$. Then for all $s \in I$, $(u(\varphi(s))v)^0(A)$ is invariant under the unipotent flow $\{u(h\varphi^{(1)}(s)) : h \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Proof of Lemma 4.4. For any $h \in \mathbb{R}$, on the one hand,

$$a(t)u(\varphi(s + e^{-(m+n)t}h))v = (u(\varphi(s + e^{-(m+n)t}h))v)^0(A) + O(e^{-\lambda(m,n)t}),$$

for some $\lambda(m, n) > 0$ depending on m and n. As $t \to \infty$,

$$(u(\varphi(s + e^{-(m+n)t}h))v)^0(A) \to (u(\varphi(s))v)^0(A), \text{ and } O(e^{-\lambda(m,n)t}) \to \mathbf{0}.$$

Thus, as $t \to \infty$,

$$a(t)u(\varphi(s + e^{-(m+n)t}h))v \to (u(\varphi(s))v)^0(A).$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & a(t)u(\varphi(s + e^{-(m+n)t}h))v \\ = \ & a(t)u(he^{-(m+n)t}\varphi^{(1)}(s))u(O(e^{-2(m+n)t}))u(\varphi(s))v \\ = \ & a(t)u(he^{-(m+n)t}\varphi^{(1)}(s))a(-t)a(t)u(O(e^{-2(m+n)t}))a(-t)a(t)u(\varphi(s))v \\ = \ & u(h\varphi^{(1)}(s))u(O(e^{-(m+n)t}))a(t)u(\varphi(s))v. \end{aligned}$$

As $t \to \infty$, $u(O(e^{-(m+n)t})) \to \mathrm{id}$, $a(t)u(\varphi(s))v \to (u(\varphi(s))v)^0(A)$. Therefore, as $t \to \infty$,

$$a(t)u(\varphi(s + e^{-(m+n)t}h))v \to u(h\varphi^{(1)}(s))(u(\varphi(s))v)^0(A).$$

This shows that $(u(\varphi(s))v)^0(A)$ is invariant under $\{u(h\varphi^{(1)}(s)) : h \in \mathbb{R}\}$. □

Proof of Lemma 4.3. The strategy of the proof is similar to that of Lemma 2.13.

We begin with the case $m = n$. This case is studied in [Yan13a] but the statement proved there is weaker than the statement here.

Fix a point $s_0 \in I$ and a subinterval $J_{s_0} \subset I$ such that $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$ is invertible for all $s \in J_{s_0}$ and moreover, $\{\mathfrak{n}^-((\varphi(s_1) - \varphi(s_0))^{-1} - (\varphi(s_2) - \varphi(s_0))^{-1}) : s_1, s_2 \in J_{s_0}\}$ is not contained in any proper observable subalgebra of $\mathfrak{sl}(2m, \mathbb{R})$. By replacing $\varphi(s)$ by $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$, we may assume that $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$.

In the isomorphism $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s))$ (see Definition 2.1), $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ corresponds to $u(\varphi(s))$, $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ corresponds to $u^-(\varphi^{-1}(s))$, and $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ corresponds to $\sigma(\varphi(s))$. By Corollary 4.2, we have that $v, u(\varphi(s))v \in V^{-0}(A)$ implies that

$$v = u^-(\varphi^{-1}(s))v^0(A).$$

In particular, $v^0(A) \neq \mathbf{0}$.

Taking any $s_1, s_2 \in J_{s_0}$, we have

$$u^-(\varphi^{-1}(s_1))v^0(A) = v = u^-(\varphi^{-1}(s_2))v^0(A).$$

This shows that $v^0(A)$ is fixed by $u^-(\varphi^{-1}(s_1) - \varphi^{-1}(s_2))$ for all $s_1, s_2 \in J_{s_0}$. By definition, $v^0(A)$ is also fixed by A. Let L denote the subgroup of H stabilizing $v^0(A)$, and $\mathfrak{l}$ denote its Lie algebra. Then from the above argument we have $\mathfrak{l}$ is observable and contains $\mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Lie}(A)$ (see (1.2)) and

$$\{\mathfrak{n}^-((\varphi(s_1) - \varphi(s_0))^{-1} - (\varphi(s_2) - \varphi(s_0))^{-1}) : s_1, s_2 \in J_{s_0}\};$$

recall that earlier we had replaced $\varphi(s)$ by $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$ and assumed that $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$ for notational simplicity. Because φ is *supergeneric*, in view of (1.3) we have that $L = H$. Since V is an irreducible representation of H, V is trivial.

This finishes the proof for $m = n$.

For the general case we give the proof by an inductive argument. Suppose the statement holds for all (m', n') such that $m' \leq m$, $n' \leq n$ and $m' + n' < m + n$. We want to prove the statement for (m, n).

We choose a point s_0 and a subinterval $J_{s_0} \subset I$ such that the following statements hold:

(1) If we write $\varphi(s) = [\varphi_1(s); \varphi_2(s)]$ where $\varphi_1(s)$ is the first m by m block, and $\varphi_2(s)$ is the rest m by $n - m$ block, then for any $s \in J_{s_0}$, $\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0)$ is invertible.

(2) The curve $\psi(s) = (\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0))^{-1}(\varphi_2(s) - \varphi_2(s_0))$ is *supergeneric* as a curve from J_{s_0} to $\mathrm{M}(m \times (n - m), \mathbb{R})$.

Without loss of generality we may assume that $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$ and $v \in V^{-0}(A)$. The notations such that $u'(\cdot)$, A_2 and $v^{\mu_0}(A)$ have the same meaning as in the proof of Lemma 2.13. Using the same argument as the proof of Lemma 2.13, we could deduce that

$$u'(\psi(s))v^{\mu_0}(A) \in V^{-0}(A_2)$$

for all $s \in J_{s_0}$. By inductive hypothesis, we conclude that $v^{\mu_0}(A)$ is fixed by the whole

$$H' := \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & \\ & \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}) \end{bmatrix} \cong \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}).$$

In particular, $v^{\mu_0}(A)$ is fixed by A_2. Let the direct sum

$$V^{\mu_0}(A) = \bigoplus_{n\delta_1 + \delta_2 = \mu_0} V^{\delta_1, \delta_2}$$

be as in the proof of Lemma 2.13. From the proof of Lemma 2.13 we know that any nonzero projection $(v^{\mu_0}(A))^{\delta_1, \delta_2}$ of $v^{\mu_0}(A)$ with respect to this direct sum satisfies δ_1 (the eigenvalue for A_1)

is non-negative. Because we have $\delta_2 = 0$ and $n\delta_1 + \delta_2 \leq 0$, we conclude that $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$. This implies that $\mu_0 = 0$. By Lemma 4.4, we have $v^0(A)$ is invariant under $\{u(h\varphi^{(1)}(s_0)) : h \in \mathbb{R}\}$. By our assumption, $\varphi^{(1)}(s_0)$ has rank b. By conjugating it with elements in H', we have that $u(X)$ fixes $v^0(A)$ for any X with rank b. Note that the space spanned by all rank b matrices is the whole space $\mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$. This shows that $v^0(A)$ is invariant under the whole $U^+(A)$. Since $v^0(A)$ is also invariant under A, $v^0(A)$ is invariant under the whole group H. Since we assume that V is an irreducible representation of H, we conclude that V is trivial.

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.3 is sufficient to prove the equidistribution result under the *supergeneric* condition. Now we consider the case $n = km$ and the curve

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

is *generic* but not *supergeneric*. In this case, we will prove the following result, which can be thought of as a generalization of Corollary 4.2.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $n = km$ and*

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

be an analytic generic *curve. Let V be an irreducible representation of $H = \mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{R})$ and $v \in V$ be a nonzero vector of V. Let A denote the diagonal subgroup as before. Suppose for all $s \in I$,*

$$u(\varphi(s))v \in V^{-0}(A),$$

then for all $s_0 \in I$ satisfying the generic *condition, we have*

$$(u(\varphi(s_0))v)^0(A) = \xi(s_0)u(\varphi(s_0))v$$

for some $\xi(s_0) = P^-(A) := U^-(A)Z_H(A) \subset H$.

This lemma is crucial for describing the obstruction to equidistribution for *generic* curves as done in §6.

Definition 4.6. Assume $n = km$, then we could write $\Phi \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ as $[\Phi_1; \Phi_2; \ldots; \Phi_k]$ where Φ_i denotes the i-th m by m block of Φ. An analytic curve $\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is called *standard* at $s_0 \in I$ if there exist k points $s_1, \ldots, s_k \in I$ such that for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, we have

$$\varphi(s_i) - \varphi(s_0) = [\mathbf{0}; \ldots; \varphi_i(s_i) - \varphi_i(s_0); \ldots; \mathbf{0}],$$

where $\varphi_i(s_i) - \varphi_i(s_0)$ is invertible, it appears in the i-th $m \times m$ block and all other blocks are $\mathbf{0}$.

In order to prove Lemma 4.5, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.7. *Assume $n = km$. For any analytic curve*

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

which is generic *at $s_0 \in I$, there exists an element $z' = z'(s_0) \in Z_H(A)$ depending analytically on s_0, such that the conjugated curve*

$$\phi := z' \cdot \varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

is standard *at s_0; where the action of $Z_H(A)$ on $\mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is given by* (2.2).

Proof. Replacing $\varphi(s)$ by $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$, we may assume that $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$.

We will prove the statement by induction on k.

When $k = 1$, the statement follows from the definition of *generic* property.

Suppose the statement holds for all $k' < k$. Then we will prove the statement for $n = km$.

We write $\varphi(s) = [\varphi_1(s); \varphi_2(s); \ldots; \varphi_k(s)]$, where $\varphi_i(s)$ is the i-th m by m block of $\varphi(s)$. From the definition of *generic* property (Definition 1.1), there exist a subinterval $J_{s_0} \subset I$ such that

for $s \in J_{s_0}$, $\varphi_1(s)$ is invertible, and the curve $\psi : J_{s_0} \to \mathrm{M}(m \times (n-m), \mathbb{R})$ defined by $\psi(s) = [\psi_1(s); \psi_2(s); \ldots; \psi_{k-1}(s)]$, where

$$\psi_i(s) = \varphi_1^{-1}(s)\varphi_i(s)$$

is *generic*.

As before, let us denote

$$u'(\psi(s)) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & & \\ & \mathrm{I}_m & \psi(s) \\ & & \mathrm{I}_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} \in Z_H(A)$$

for $s \in J_{s_0}$. Now we fix a point $s_1 \in J_{s_0}$ and a subinterval $J_{s_1} \subset J_{s_0}$ such that ψ satisfies the *generic* condition for s_1 and J_{s_1}. Replacing φ by $u'(\psi(s_1)) \cdot \varphi$, we get

$$\varphi(s_1) = [\varphi_1(s_1); \mathbf{0}; \ldots; \mathbf{0}] \text{ and } \psi(s_1) = \mathbf{0}.$$

Let

$$A' := \left\{ a'(t) := \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & & \\ & e^{(n-m)t}\mathrm{I}_m & \\ & & e^{-mt}\mathrm{I}_{n-m} \end{bmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}$$

and

$$H' := \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & \\ & X \end{bmatrix} : X \in \mathrm{SL}(n, \mathbb{R}) \right\} \subset Z_H(A).$$

By inductive hypothesis, there exists $z'' \in Z_{H'}(A') \subset Z_H(A)$, such that $z'' \cdot \psi$ is *standard* at s_1. Since $\psi(s_1) = \mathbf{0}$, there exist $s_2, s_3, \ldots, s_k \in J_{s_1}$ such that

$$z'' \cdot \psi(s_i) = [\mathbf{0}; \ldots; \psi_{i-1}(s_i); \ldots; \mathbf{0}], \text{ for } i = 2, \ldots, k,$$

where the $(i-1)$-th $m \times m$ block $\psi_{i-1}(s_i)$ is invertible. Now we replace φ by $z'' \cdot \varphi$. Note that by definition, $\varphi_i(s) = \varphi_1(s)\psi_{i-1}(s)$ for $i = 2, \ldots, k$, and $s \in J_{s_0}$. Thus, we have for $i = 2, \ldots, k$,

$$\varphi(s_i) = [\varphi_1(s_i); \mathbf{0}; \ldots; \mathbf{0}; \varphi_1(s_i)\psi_{i-1}(s_i); \mathbf{0}; \ldots; \mathbf{0}].$$

Let z_1 denote the following element:

$$z_1 := \begin{bmatrix} \mathrm{I}_m & & & & \\ & \mathrm{I}_m & & & \\ & \psi_1^{-1}(s_2) & \mathrm{I}_m & & \\ & \vdots & & \ddots & \\ & \psi_{k-1}^{-1}(s_k) & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathrm{I}_m \end{bmatrix} \in Z_H(A).$$

By direct calculation, we have that $z_1 \cdot \varphi$ is *standard* at s_0 with given $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k$.

This completes the proof.

□

Now we are ready to prove Lemma 4.5.

Proof of Lemma 4.5. By Lemma 4.7, we may conjugate the curve by some $z'(s_0) \in Z_H(A)$, such that the conjugated curve, which we still denote by φ, satisfies the following: there exist $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k \in I$, such that

$$\varphi(s_i) - \varphi(s_0) = [\mathbf{0}; \ldots; \varphi_i(s_i) - \varphi_i(s_0); \mathbf{0}; \ldots; \mathbf{0}] \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \ldots, k.$$

Replacing v by $u(\varphi(s_0))v$ and $\varphi(s)$ by $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$, we may assume that $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$ and $v \in V^{-0}(A)$. Then it suffices to show that

$$v = \xi v^0(A), \text{ for some } \xi \in P^-(A). \tag{4.15}$$

For each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, let

$$A_i := \left\{ a_i(t) := \begin{bmatrix} e^t \mathrm{I}_m & & & & \\ & \ddots & & & \\ & & e^{-t}\mathrm{I}_m & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & \mathrm{I}_m \end{bmatrix} : t \in \mathbb{R} \right\},$$

where $e^{-t}\mathrm{I}_m$ appears in the $(i+1)$-th $m \times m$ diagonal block. We denote its Lie algebra by

$$\mathfrak{a}_i := \{t\mathcal{A}_i : t \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

where $\mathcal{A}_i := \log a_i(1)$. Let $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s_i))$ denote the $\mathrm{SL}(2, \mathbb{R})$ copy in H containing A_i as the diagonal subgroup and $\{u(r\varphi(s_i)) : r \in \mathbb{R}\}$ as the upper triangular unipotent subgroup.

We express the representation V as the direct sum of common eigenspaces of $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k$:

$$V = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\delta}=(\delta_1,\ldots,\delta_k)} V(\boldsymbol{\delta}), \tag{4.16}$$

where

$$V(\boldsymbol{\delta}) := \left\{ v \in V : a_i(t)v = e^{\delta_i t} v \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \ldots, k \text{ and } t \in \mathbb{R} \right\}.$$

Let $w \in V(\boldsymbol{\delta})$. We claim that for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$ and $\mathbf{e}_i = (-1, \ldots, -2, \ldots, -1)$, with 2 in the i-th coordinate,

$$\mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i))w \in V(\boldsymbol{\delta} - \mathbf{e}_i), \tag{4.17}$$

recall that $\mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i)) = \log u(\varphi(s_i))$.

It is straight forward to check that

$$[\mathcal{A}_i, \mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i))] = 2\mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i)) \text{ and } [\mathcal{A}_j, \mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i))] = \mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i)) \text{ for } j \neq i.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{A}_j\mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i))w = \mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i))\mathcal{A}_j w + [\mathcal{A}_j, \mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i))]w = \begin{cases} (\delta_j + 1)w & \text{if } j \neq i \\ (\delta_i + 2)w & \text{if } j = i. \end{cases}$$

This proves (4.17).

Let $\mathcal{A} := \log a(1)$, it is easy to see that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 + \cdots + \mathcal{A}_k$. Therefore,

$$V^\sigma(A) = \bigoplus_{\delta_1+\cdots+\delta_k=\sigma} V(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k).$$

On the other hand, because $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ normalize $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s_i))$ for any $i = 1, \ldots, k$, we can decompose V into the direct sum of irreducible representations V_p of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s_i))$ which are invariant under $A_1, \ldots, A_k$:

$$V = \bigoplus_p V_p. \tag{4.18}$$

For each V_p, we can choose a basis $\{w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_l\}$, called a *standard basis*, of V_p such that for each $1 \leq r \leq l$, w_r is contained in some weight space $V(\delta_1, \delta_2, \cdots, \delta_k)$, and we index the basis elements such that $a_i(t)w_r = e^{(l-2r)t}w_r$; that is,

$$\text{if } w_r \in V(\delta_1, \delta_2, \cdots, \delta_k) \text{ then } \delta_i = l - 2r. \tag{4.19}$$

Moreover since $\mathfrak{n}(\varphi(s_i))w_s$ is a nonzero multiple of w_{s-1} for $1 \leq s \leq l$, by (4.17) we have that

$$w_{r-j} \in V(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e_i}), \quad \text{for } r - l \leq j \leq r. \tag{4.20}$$

Let

$$\pi_p : V \to V_p$$

denote the canonical projection from V to V_p with respect to (4.18), and let

$$q(\boldsymbol{\delta}) : V \to V(\boldsymbol{\delta})$$

denote the canonical projection from V to $V(\boldsymbol{\delta})$ with respect to (4.16). Then

$$\pi_p \circ q(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = q(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \circ \pi_p. \tag{4.21}$$

We call a vector $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ *admissible* if it can be written as $c_1\mathbf{e}_1 + c_2\mathbf{e}_2 + \cdots + c_k\mathbf{e}_k$, where $c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_k$ are non-negative integers.

Claim 4.8. Any $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k)$ such that $q(\boldsymbol{\delta})(v) \neq 0$ is *admissible*.

Proof of Claim 4.8. By (4.19), $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$. For $\boldsymbol{\delta} = (\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k)$, define $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}) := \delta_1 + \cdots + \delta_k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $v \in V^{0-}(A)$, we have $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0$. We now begin by assuming that the statement of this claim is valid for any $\boldsymbol{\delta}'$ such that $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}') > \sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta})$; note that the statement is vacuously true if $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = 0$ (in fact, in this case we have that $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbf{0}$).

Let $1 \leq i \leq k$ be such that $\delta_i = \min(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_k)$. Then

$$\delta_i \leq \sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta})/k \leq 0, \text{ and if } \delta_i = 0 \text{ then } \boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbf{0}. \tag{4.22}$$

For this choice of i, consider the decomposition (4.18) of V as $V = \bigoplus_p V_p$ with respect to the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s_i))$. There exists some V_p such that $\pi_p(q(\boldsymbol{\delta})v) \neq \mathbf{0}$. If $\{w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_l\}$ denotes the standard basis of V_p, then by (4.19), $\pi_p(q(\boldsymbol{\delta})v)$ is a nonzero multiple of w_r for some $0 \leq r \leq l$ such that $\delta_i = l - 2r$.

If $\pi_p(v)$ has a non-zero coefficient on w_{r-j} for some $1 \leq j \leq r$, then by (4.20), we have $w_{r-j} \in V(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i)$. But then $q(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i)(v) \neq 0$ and $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i) = \sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}) + j(k+1) > \sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta})$. By our inductive hypothesis, $\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i$ is admissible, and hence $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is admissible.

Now we can suppose that $\pi_p(v)$ is contained in the span of $w_r, \ldots, w_l$. Then

$$a_i(t)w_{r+j} = e^{(\delta_i - 2j)t}w_{r+j} \text{ and } \delta_i - 2j \leq \delta_i, \quad \forall\, j = 0, \ldots, l - r.$$

Therefore by (4.1) in Lemma 4.1 applied to V_p and the action of $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi_i(s_i))$, we have that $\pi_p(u(\varphi_i(s_i))v) = u(\varphi_i(s_i))\pi_p(v)$ has a nonzero coefficient on w_{r-j} for some j such that

$$a_i(t)w_{r-j} = e^{(\delta_i + 2j)t}w_{r-j} \text{ and } \delta_i + 2j \geq -\delta_i.$$

Hence $j \geq -\delta_i$. By (4.20) $w_{r-j} \in V(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i)$. Therefore,

$$q(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i)(\pi_p(u(\varphi_i(s_i))v) \neq 0.$$

By (4.22),

$$\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i) = \sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}) + j(k+1) \geq \sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}) - (k+1)\delta_i \geq \sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta})(1 - (k+1)/k) \geq 0. \tag{4.23}$$

By our assumption, $u(\varphi_i(s_i))v \in V^{0-}(A)$, and hence $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta} - j\mathbf{e}_i) \leq 0$. Therefore all terms in (4.23) are zero. Therefore $\sigma(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = 0$ and $\delta_i = 0$. Therefore by (4.22), we have that $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \mathbf{0}$, which is admissible. This completes the proof of Claim 4.8. □

Now we get back to the proof of (4.15). For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, k$, let us denote

$$E_0 = \{\mathbf{0}\} \text{ and } E_i := \{c_1\mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + c_i\mathbf{e}_i : c_1, \ldots, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\},$$

and define for any $v' \in V$,

$$v'_i := \sum_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in E_i} q(\boldsymbol{\delta})(v'). \tag{4.24}$$

By Claim 4.8, $v = v_k$ and $v^0 = q(\mathbf{0})(v) = v_0$. Therefore, in order to prove (4.15), it is sufficient to show the following:

$$v_i \in U^-(A)v_{i-1}, \quad \text{for all } 1 \le i \le k. \tag{4.25}$$

To prove this, fix any $1 \le i \le k$ and consider the decomposition

$$V = \bigoplus_p V_p$$

as in (4.18) into $\mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s_i))$-irreducible and $A_1, \dots, A_k$-invariant subspaces V_p. Let $\pi_p : V \to V_p$ denote the canonical projection with respect to this decomposition. By (4.21) and (4.24),

$$\pi_p(v')_j = \pi_p(v'_j), \quad \text{for all } v' \in V \text{ and } j = 0, 1, \dots, k.$$

Hence

$$\pi_p(v_{i-1}) = \pi_p((v_i)_{i-1}) = \pi_p(v_i)_{i-1}.$$

Therefore

$$\text{if } \pi_p(v_i) = 0 \text{ then } \pi_p(v_{i-1}) = 0. \tag{4.26}$$

Now suppose that $\pi_p(v_i) \neq 0$. Let $\{w_0, \dots, w_l\}$ denote a standard basis of V_p; that is, (4.19) holds. Let $0 \le r \le l$ be such that

$$\pi_p(v_i) \subset \mathrm{Span}\{w_r, \dots, w_l\} \setminus \mathrm{Span}\{w_{r+1}, \dots, w_l\}. \tag{4.27}$$

In particular, $\pi_p(v_i)$ has a nonzero projection on w_r. Hence by Claim 4.8,

$$w_r \in V(c_1\mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + c_i\mathbf{e}_i) \quad \text{for some } c_1, \dots, c_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}. \tag{4.28}$$

By (4.20) we have that

$$w_{r+j} \in V(c_1\mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + c_{i-1}\mathbf{e}_{i-1} + (c_i + j)\mathbf{e}_i), \quad \text{for all } -r \le j \le l - r. \tag{4.29}$$

Therefore $\pi_p(v) \in \sum_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in E_i} V^{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$. Hence

$$\pi_p(v_i) = \pi_p(v)_i = \pi_p(v). \tag{4.30}$$

By (4.29) we have

$$a_i(t)w_{r+j} = e^{-(\lambda+2j)t} \quad \text{for } -r \le j \le l - r, \text{ where } \lambda = c_1 + \cdots + c_{i-1} + 2c_i. \tag{4.31}$$

We apply Lemma 4.1 to the $\mathrm{SL}_2(\varphi(s_i))$-action on V_p and the vector $\pi_p(v_i)$. Let $-r \le j \le l - r$ be such that

$$u(\varphi(s_i))\pi_p(v_i) \subset \mathrm{Span}\{w_{r+j}, \dots, w_l\} \setminus \mathrm{Span}\{w(r + j + 1), \dots, w_l\}. \tag{4.32}$$

Then by (4.1), (4.27) and (4.31) we get

$$-(\lambda + 2j) \ge \lambda. \tag{4.33}$$

On the other hand by (4.30) and our basic assumption we have

$$u(\varphi(s_i))\pi_p(v_i) = u(\varphi(s_i))\pi_p(v) = \pi_p(u(\varphi(s_i))v) \in V^{0-}(A).$$

Hence by (4.29) and (4.32) we have

$$0 \ge \sigma(c_1\mathbf{e}_1 + \cdots + c_{i-1}\mathbf{e}_{i-1} + (c_i + j)\mathbf{e}_i) = (\lambda - c_i + j)(-(k + 1)). \tag{4.34}$$

Now combining (4.33) and (4.34), and we get

$$c_i \le \lambda + j \le 0.$$

On the other hand, by (4.28), $c_i \ge 0$. Therefore $c_i = 0$ and $j = -\lambda$. Since $c_i = 0$, by (4.29) we have that the projection of $\pi_p(v_i)$ on the line $\mathbb{R}w_r$ equals

$$\pi_p(v_i)_{i-1} = \pi_p((v_i)_{i-1}) = \pi_p(v_{i-1}).$$

And since $j = -\lambda$, we have equality in (4.33), which corresponds to equality in (4.1) of Lemma 4.1. Therefore (4.3) holds and in view of Definition 2.1, we get

$$\pi_p(v_i) = u^-(\mathbf{0}, \dots, -\varphi(s_i)^{-1}, \dots, \mathbf{0})\pi_p(v_{i-1}) = \pi_p(u^-(0, \dots, -\varphi(s_i)^{-1}, \dots, 0)v_{i-1}), \tag{4.35}$$

where

$$u^-(\mathbf{0}, \dots, -\varphi(s_i)^{-1}, \dots, \mathbf{0}) := \begin{bmatrix} I_m & & & & & \\ \mathbf{0} & I_m & & & & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & & \\ -\varphi(s_i)^{-1} & & & I_m & & \\ \vdots & & & & \ddots & \\ \mathbf{0} & & & & & I_m \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}(2, \varphi(s_i)) \cap U^-(A).$$

Therefore, due to (4.26), (4.35) holds for all p, and hence (4.25) holds.

This completes the proof. □

Remark 4.9.

(1) Though our proof works for the special case $n = km$, we conjecture that the conclusion of Lemma 4.5 should hold for the case of general (m, n).

(2) From the proof we can see, if we assume $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$ and $v \in V^{-0}(A)$, then $z'(s_0) \cdot v^0(A)$ is fixed by

$$B := \left\{ b(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k) := \begin{bmatrix} e^{t_1}\mathrm{I}_m & & & \\ & e^{t_2}\mathrm{I}_m & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & e^{t_k}\mathrm{I}_m \end{bmatrix} : t_1 + t_2 + \cdots + t_k = 0 \right\},$$

which is the diagonal subgroup generated by $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_k$.

5. Proof of the equidistribution result

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.4. The non-divergence part of the theorem has been proved in §2 (see Remark 2.14). Here we will prove the equidistribution part. The proof is based on Proposition 3.5 and Lemma 4.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Suppose $\varphi : I \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is *supergeneric*, and the normalized parametric measures $\{\lambda_t : t > 0\}$ do not tend to the Haar measure μ_G along some subsequence $t_i \to +\infty$. By Proposition 3.5, there exists some $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that

$$u(\varphi(s))g\gamma p_L \in V^{-0}(A)$$

for all $s \in I$. Then by Lemma 4.3, we have that $v := g\gamma p_L$ is fixed by the whole group H. Hence p_L is fixed by the action of $\gamma^{-1}g^{-1}Hg\gamma$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma p_L &= \overline{\Gamma p_L} \text{ since } \Gamma p_L \text{ is discrete} \\ &= \overline{\Gamma\gamma^{-1}g^{-1}Hg\gamma p_L} \\ &= \overline{\Gamma g^{-1}Hg\gamma p_L} \\ &= Gg\gamma p_L \text{ since } \overline{Hg\Gamma} = G \\ &= Gp_L. \end{aligned}$$

This implies $G_0 p_L = p_L$ where G_0 is the connected component of e. In particular, $\gamma^{-1}g^{-1}Hg\gamma \subset G_0$ and $G_0 \subset N_G^1(L)$. By [Sha09a, Theorem 2.3], there exists a closed subgroup $F_1 \subset N_G^1(L)$ containing all Ad-unipotent one-parameter subgroups of G contained in $N_G^1(L)$ such that $F_1 \cap \Gamma$ is a lattice in F_1 and $\pi(F_1)$ is closed. If we put $F = g\gamma F_1\gamma^{-1}g^{-1}$, then $H \subset F$ since H is generated by

it unipotent one-parameter subgroups. Moreover, $Fx = g\gamma\pi(F_1)$ is closed and admits a finite F-invariant measure. Then since $\overline{Hx} = G/\Gamma$, we have $F = G$. This implies $F_1 = G$ and thus $L \lhd G$. Therefore $N(L, W) = G$. In particular, $W \subset L$, and thus $L \cap H$ is a normal subgroup of H containing W. Since H is a simple group, we have $H \subset L$. Since L is a normal subgroup of G and $\pi(L)$ is a closed orbit with finite L-invariant measure, every orbit of L on G/Γ is also closed and admits a finite L-invariant measure, in particular, Lx is closed. But since Hx is dense in G/Γ, Lx is also dense. This shows that $L = G$, which contradicts our hypothesis that the limit measure is not μ_G.

This completes the proof. □

6. Obstruction of equidistribution

We will study the obstruction of equidistribution of the expanding curves $\{a(t)u(\varphi(I))x : t > 0\}$ as $t \to +\infty$ and describe limit measures if equidistribution fails.

At first, if the *generic* condition fails, then it is possible that the limit measure μ_∞ of $\{\lambda_t : t > 0\}$ along some subsequence $t_i \to \infty$ is not a probability measure. In other words, part of the expanding curves might escape to infinity along this subsequence. In fact, for $G = H = \mathrm{SL}(m + n, \mathbb{R})$ and $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}(m+n, \mathbb{Z})$, it is not hard to construct some special curve φ such that $a(t)u(\varphi(I))[e] \to \infty$ as $t \to \infty$. We refer the reader to [KW08] and [KMW10] for more examples. In this paper, we focus on *generic* curves.

If m and n are co-prime, the *generic* condition is the same as the *supergeneric* condition, so there is nothing to discuss in this case.

Therefore we consider the case $(m, n) > 1$ and the analytic curve

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

is *generic* but not *supergeneric*. However, for now, we could only handle the case $n = km$ where $k > 1$ is some positive integer (to handle general (m, n), we need some general version of Lemma 4.5). With these assumptions, we want to describe the obstruction of equidistribution of $\{a(t)u(\varphi(I))x : t > 0\}$ as $t \to \infty$.

In this section, we always assume that $n = km$ and the analytic curve

$$\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$$

is *generic*.

First note that for $L \in \mathcal{L}$, the stabilizer of p_L is $N_G^1(L)$ where

$$N_G^1(L) := \{g \in G : gLg^{-1} = L \text{ and } \det(\mathrm{Ad}(g)|_{\mathfrak{l}}) = 1\}.$$

Theorem 6.1 (See [Sha09c, Proposition 4.9])**.** *Suppose the expanding curves $a(t)u(\varphi(s))x$ are not tending to be equidistributed along some subsequence $t_i \to +\infty$. By Proposition 3.5, there exist $L \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that*

$$u(\varphi(s))g\gamma p_L \in V^{-0}(A),$$

for all $s \in I$. Then there exist $h \in P^-(A)$ and some algebraic subgroup F of G containing A such that $h^{-1}Fh$ fixes $v := g\gamma p_L$ and

$$u(\varphi(s)) \in P^-(A)Fh$$

for all $s \in I$. Recall that $P^-(A) = U^-(A)Z_H(A)$ denotes the maximal parabolic subgroup of H associated with A.

Proof. Let $s_0 \in I$ such that every point in a neighborhood J of s_0 satisfies the *generic* condition. Replacing v by $u(\varphi(s_0))v$ and $\varphi(s)$ by $\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0)$, we may assume that $\varphi(s_0) = \mathbf{0}$. By Lemma 4.5, for every $s \in I$, we have that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} a(t)u(\varphi(s))v = (u(\varphi(s))v)^0(A) = \xi(s)u(\varphi(s))v,$$

for some $\xi(s) \in P^-(A)$. Let $p_0 = v^0(A)$. Then $p_0 = \xi(s_0)v$. This implies that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} a(t)u(\varphi(s))\xi(s_0)^{-1}p_0 = \xi(s)u(\varphi(s))\xi(s_0)^{-1}p_0.$$

Let $F_1 := N_G^1(L)$, then F_1 is the stabilizer of $p_L = (g\gamma)^{-1}v = (g\gamma)^{-1}\xi(s_0)^{-1}p_0$. Let $F := (\xi(s_0)g\gamma)F_1(\xi(s_0)g\gamma)^{-1}$, then F is the stabilizer of p_0. Then $A \subset F$ since p_0 is invariant under A.

Since Gp_0 is open in its closure, the map $gF \mapsto gp_0 : G/F \to Gp_0$ is a homeomorphism. Thus we have that in G/F,

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} a(t)u(\varphi(s))\xi(s_0)^{-1}F = \xi(s)u(\varphi(s))\xi(s_0)^{-1}F. \tag{6.1}$$

Since the Lie algebra of F is $\{\mathrm{Ad}(a(t)) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$-invariant, there exists an $\{\mathrm{Ad}(a(t)) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$-invariant subspace W of the Lie algebra of H complementary to the Lie algebra of F. We decompose $W = S^0 \oplus W^- \oplus W^+$ into the fixed point space, the contracting subspace and the expanding subspace for the action of $\mathrm{Ad}(a(t))$ as $t \to +\infty$. Then for all $s \in J$ near s_0 we have,

$$\xi(s)u(\varphi(s))\xi(s_0)^{-1}F = \exp(w^0(s))\exp(w^-(s))\exp(w^+(s))F, \tag{6.2}$$

for all $s \in J$ near s_0, where $w^0 \in W^0$, and $w^\pm \in W^\pm$. Combing (6.1) and (6.2), we deduce that $w^+(s) = 0$ for all s near s_0. Thus we get $\xi(s)u(\varphi(s))\xi(s_0)^{-1}F = \exp(w^0(s))\exp(w^-(s))F$. Let $\eta(s) := \exp(w^0(s))\exp(w^-(s))$. It is easy to see that $\eta(s) \in P^-(A)$. Hence for all $s \in J$ near s_0, we have $u(\varphi(s)) \in \xi(s)^{-1}\eta(s)F\xi(s_0)$. Therefore by the analyticity of φ, we get that

$$\{u(\varphi(s)) : s \in I\} \subset P^-(A)F\xi(s_0) \cap U^+(A) = P^-(A)(F \cap H)\xi(s_0) \cap U^+(A).$$

This proves the statement for $h = \xi(s_0)$. □

Remark 6.2. It may be noted that since by a result of Dani and Margulis, the orbit Γp_L is discrete, we have that ΓF_1 is closed in G. Therefore for $h = \xi(s_0) \in P^-(A)$, we have $Fhg\Gamma = (hg\gamma)F_1\Gamma$ is closed. Thus there exist analytic curves $\xi^- : I \to U^-(A)$ and $\xi^0 : I \to Z_H(A)$ such that $u(\varphi(s))x \subset \xi^-(s)\xi^0(s)Fhx$ for all $s \in I$. Then as $t \to \infty$, the distance between $a(t)u(\varphi(s))x$ and $\xi^0(s)Fhx$ tends to zero, since $Fhx = Fhg\Gamma$ is a proper closed $\{a(t)\}$-invariant subset of G/Γ. Thus every limit measure of the sequence $\{\mu_t\}$ as $t \to +\infty$ is a probability measure whose support is contained in $\xi^0(I)Fhx$. Replacing F by a smaller subgroup containing A, we can actually ensure that Fhx admits a finite F-invariant measure.

We conjecture that in the general case of $(m, n) > 1$, if φ is *generic*, then Lemma 4.5, Theorem 6.1, and Remark 6.2 should hold.

Appendix A. Relation between the condition given in [Aka+14] and the *generic* condition

It is worth explaining the condition given in [Aka+14] and its relation to our *generic* condition.

We denote $M(s) := [\mathrm{I}_m; \varphi(s)] \in \mathrm{M}(m \times (m+n), \mathbb{R})$. Given a subspace W and $0 < r < \frac{m \dim W}{m+n}$, we define the pencil $\mathcal{P}_{W,r}$ to be

$$\mathcal{P}_{W,r} := \{M \in \mathrm{M}(m \times (m+n), \mathbb{R}) : \dim MW = r\}.$$

In [Aka+14], the following theorem is announced: if a submanifold is not contained in any such pencil, then the submanifold is extremal. In our case, it says that if the curve $\{M(s) : s \in I\}$ is not contained in any pencil $\mathcal{P}_{W,r}$, then the curve is extremal. It is easy to see that if W is a rational subspace, then $\mathcal{P}_{W,r}$ is not extremal. So this condition is considered almost optimal.

Proposition A.1. *Suppose that the analytic curve $\varphi : I = [a, b] \to \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$ is* generic*, then the curve $\{M(s) = [\mathrm{I}_m; \varphi(s)] : s \in I\}$ is not contained in any pencil $\mathcal{P}_{W,r}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that every point in I satisfies the *generic* condition.

We will prove the statement by induction on (m, n). Without loss of generality, we may assume that $m \leq n$.

We first prove the statement holds for (n, n). For contradiction, suppose that there exists some subspace W and $0 < r < \frac{\dim W}{2}$ such that

$$M(s) = [\mathrm{I}_n; \varphi(s)] \in \mathcal{P}_{W,r} \text{ for all } s \in I.$$

This implies that $\mathrm{Ker}M(s) \cap W > \frac{\dim W}{2}$ for all $s \in I$. Then for any $s_1, s_2 \in I$, the dimension of $\mathrm{Ker}M(s_1) \cap \mathrm{Ker}M(s_2) \cap W$ is greater than 0, since the sum of $\dim(\mathrm{Ker}M(s_1) \cap W)$ and $\dim(\mathrm{Ker}M(s_2) \cap W)$ is greater than $\dim W$. It is easy to see that

$$\mathrm{Ker}M(s) = \{(-\varphi(s)w, w) : w \in \mathbb{R}^n\}.$$

Therefore, there exist $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ such that $(-\varphi(s_1)w_1, w_1) = (-\varphi(s_2)w_2, w_2)$. This implies $w_1 = w_2$ and $\varphi(s_1)w_1 = \varphi(s_2)w_1$. Therefore $(\varphi(s_1) - \varphi(s_2))w_1 = 0$. But this is impossible since $w_1 \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\varphi(s_1) - \varphi(s_2)$ is invertible. This contradiction shows the statement for (n, n).

Suppose the statement holds for all (m', n') such that $m' \leq m$, $n' \leq n$ and $m' + n' < m + n$, we want to prove the statement for (m, n). Suppose not, then the curve $\{M(s) = [\mathrm{I}_m; \varphi(s)] : s \in I\}$ is contained in some pencil $\mathcal{P}_{W,r}$ where $r < \frac{m \dim W}{m+n}$. Let us fix some $s_0 \in I$ and denote $W_0 := \mathrm{Ker}M(s_0) \cap W$. Then from our assumption we have that $\dim W_0 = \dim W - r$. For any $s \in I$, since $\dim(\mathrm{Ker}M(s) \cap W) = \dim W - r$, we have that

$$\dim(\mathrm{Ker}M(s) \cap W_0) = \dim(\mathrm{Ker}M(s) \cap \mathrm{Ker}M(s_0) \cap W) \geq 2(\dim W - r) - \dim W = \dim W - 2r = \dim W_0 - r.$$

Therefore, $\dim M(s)W_0 \leq r$ for all $s \in I$.

We write any $w \in W \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+n}$ as (w_1, w_2) where $w_1 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Since $W_0 = \mathrm{Ker}M(s_0) \cap W$, every $(w_1, w_2) \in W_0$ satisfies that $w_1 = -\varphi(s_0)w_2$. By identifying $(-\varphi(s_0)w_2, w_2)$ with $w_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we may consider W_0 as a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$. By direct calculation, we have that under this identification, $M(s) : W_0 \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined as follows:

$$M(s) : w \in W_0 \mapsto (\varphi(s) - \varphi(s_0))w \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Following our previous notation, we may write $\varphi(s) = [\varphi_1(s); \varphi_2(s)]$ where $\varphi_1(s)$ denotes the first m by m block of $\varphi(s)$ and $\varphi_2(s)$ denotes the rest m by $n-m$ block. By our assumption, $\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0)$ is invertible for s inside some subinterval $J_{s_0} \subset I$. Accordingly we may write $w \in W_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ as (w_3, w_4) where $w_3 \in \mathbb{R}^m$ and $w_4 \in \mathbb{R}^{n-m}$. For $s \in J_{s_0}$, let us denote

$$\psi(s) := (\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0))^{-1}(\varphi_2(s) - \varphi_2(s_0)) \in \mathrm{M}(m \times (n-m), \mathbb{R})$$

and $N(s) := [\mathrm{I}_m; \psi(s)] \in \mathrm{M}(m \times n, \mathbb{R})$. By our assumption, $\psi : J_{s_0} \to \mathrm{M}(m \times (n-m), \mathbb{R})$ is *generic*. Then for $w = (w_3, w_4) \in W_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} M(s)w &= M(s)(w_3, w_4) \\ &= (\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0))w_3 + (\varphi_2(s) - \varphi_2(s_0))w_4 \\ &= (\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0))(w_3 + \psi(s)w_4) \\ &= (\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0))N(s)(w_3, w_4). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi_1(s) - \varphi_1(s_0)$ is invertible, we have that $\dim M(s)W_0 = \dim N(s)W_0$. Therefore,

$$\dim N(s)W_0 \leq r, \text{ for all } s \in J_{s_0}.$$

This implies that there exists some $r' \leq r$ and some subinterval $J'_{s_0} \subset J_{s_0}$ such that $\dim N(s)W_0 = r'$ for all $s \in J'_{s_0}$, i.e.,

$$N(s) \in \mathcal{P}_{W_0,r'} \text{ for all } s \in J'_{s_0}.$$

But this contradicts our inductive assumption for case $(m, n-m)$. In fact, $W_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^{m+(n-m)}$, $N(s) = [\mathrm{I}_m; \psi(s)]$ where the curve $\psi(s) \in \mathrm{M}(m \times (n-m), \mathbb{R})$ is *generic*. Thus to apply the inductive assumption for $(m, n-m)$, it suffices to check that $r' < \frac{m \dim W_0}{n}$. Since $r' \leq r$, we only need to show that $r < \frac{m \dim W_0}{n}$. The inequality is equivalent to

$$nr < m \dim W_0 = m(\dim W - r).$$

It is straightforward to check that it is the same as

$$r < \frac{m \dim W}{m+n},$$

which is our assumption. This allows us to apply the inductive assumption and conclude the contradiction.

This completes the proof. □

Therefore the *generic* condition implies the condition given in [Aka+14].

References

[Aka+14] Menny Aka et al. "On metric diophantine approximation in matrices and Lie groups". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.3996* (2014).

[Bak78] RC Baker. "Dirichlet's theorem on Diophantine approximation". In: *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*. Vol. 83. 01. Cambridge Univ Press. 1978, pp. 37–59.

[Bug02] Yann Bugeaud. "Approximation by algebraic integers and Hausdorff dimension". In: *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* 65.3 (2002), pp. 547–559.

[Dan84] SG Dani. "On orbits of unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces". In: *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* 4.01 (1984), pp. 25–34.

[DS70] H. Davenport and W. Schmidt. "Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation. II". In: *Acta Arithmetica* 16.4 (1970), pp. 413–424.

[KM98] Dmitry Y Kleinbock and Grigorij A Margulis. "Flows on homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation on manifolds". In: *Annals of mathematics* (1998), pp. 339–360.

[KMW10] Dmitry Kleinbock, Gregory Margulis, and Junbo Wang. "Metric Diophantine approximation for systems of linear forms via dynamics". In: *International Journal of Number Theory* 6.05 (2010), pp. 1139–1168.

[KW08] Dmitry Kleinbock and Barak Weiss. "Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation and homogeneous flows". In: *Journal of Modern Dynamics* 2.1 (2008), pp. 43–62.

[MS95] Shahar Mozes and Nimish Shah. "On the space of ergodic invariant measures of unipotent flows". In: *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* 15.1 (1995), pp. 149–159. ISSN: 0143-3857. DOI: 10.1017/S0143385700008282. URL: http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.ohio-state.edu/10

[Rat91] Marina Ratner. "On Raghunathan's measure conjecture". In: *Annals of Mathematics* (1991), pp. 545–607.

[Sha10] Nimish Shah. "Expanding translates of curves and Dirichlet-Minkowski theorem on linear forms". In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 23.2 (2010), pp. 563–589.

[Sha09a] Nimish A. Shah. "Asymptotic evolution of smooth curves under geodesic flow on hyperbolic manifolds". In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 148.2 (2009), pp. 281–304.

[Sha09b] Nimish A Shah. "Equidistribution of expanding translates of curves and Dirichlet's theorem on diophantine approximation". In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 177.3 (2009), pp. 509–532.

[Sha09c] Nimish A. Shah. "Limiting distributions of curves under geodesic flow on hyperbolic manifolds". In: *Duke Mathematical Journal* 148.2 (2009), pp. 251–279.

[Yan13a] Lei Yang. "Equidistribution of expanding curves in homogeneous spaces and Diophantine approximation for square matrices". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.1106* (2013).

[Yan13b] Lei Yang. "Expanding curves in $\mathrm{T}^1(\mathbb{H}^n)$ under geodesic flow and equidistribution in homogeneous spaces". In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.6023* (2013).

Department of Mathematics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210
E-mail address: shah@math.osu.edu

Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, Berkeley, CA, 94720
E-mail address: lyang@msri.org
Current address: Einstein Institute of Mathematics, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 9190401, Israel
E-mail address: yang.lei@mail.huji.ac.il